

JPRS-UPS-85-028

4 April 1985

# USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

4 April 1985

USSR REPORT  
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

## CONTENTS

## INTERNATIONAL

PRAVDA Surveys Main 39th UN General Assembly Resolutions (PRAVDA, 16 Dec 84) .....	1
Japan's Export of Dual-Use Technology to U.S. Criticized (Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 8 Mar 85) .....	4
Hiroshima, Dresden WW II Bombing Seen as Means To 'Scare' USSR (Vsevolod Ovchinnikov; PRAVDA, 7 Mar 85) .....	6
Papers From Journal Roundtable on Counterpropaganda (V. D. Granov, et al.; NAUCHNYY KOMMUNIZM, No 5, Sep- Oct 84) .....	8
TASS Notes Arab Communists' Concern Over Jordan-PLO Accord (APN DAILY REVIEW; 28 Feb 85) .....	52
Further Commentaries Assail SDI (NEW TIMES, No 8, Feb 85; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 22 Feb 85)	57
U.S. Plans Described, Aleksey Karinin Interview Reagan Arguments Refuted, by Aleksey Arbatov	

## NATIONAL

Stalin's Plan for Postwar Arrangement of Europe, 1941-1943 (V. K. Volkov; NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA, No 6, Nov-Dec 84) .....	60
KGB Major-General Dies After Serious Illness (KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 13 Feb 85) .....	87
Youth Paper Recounts Life of Atheist in Religious Family (N. Beni; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 10 Mar 85) .....	88

<b>Briefs</b>	
Death of Soviet Major-General Noted	89
<b>REGIONAL</b>	
Shevardnadze Speaks at Banner Ceremony (ZARYA VOSTOKA, 3 Mar 85) .....	90
Gapurov Addresses Turkmen Agricultural Meeting (Ashkhabad Domestic Service, 5 Mar 85) .....	97
Gapurov Addresses Party Commission Meeting (Askhabad Domestic Service, 6 Mar 85) .....	99
Party Secretary Briefs Ukrainian Social Scientists (RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 3 Mar 85) .....	100
Armenian Supreme Soviet Election Results (SOVETAKAN AYASTAN, 1 Mar 85) .....	101
Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Holds Regular Session (SOVETAKAN AYASTAN, 1 Mar 85) .....	103
Armenian Supreme Soviet Industry Commission Meets (SOVETAKAN AYASTAN, 10 Feb 85) .....	105
Armenian SSR Procuratorial Bodies Meet (SOVETAKAN AYASTAN, 7 Feb 85) .....	106
KaSSR Council of Ministers on 1984 Plan Fulfillment (KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 7 Feb 85) .....	108
PRAVDA Reports Georgian Plenum on Cadre Policy (G. Lebanidze; PRAVDA, 4 Mar 85) .....	110
Editor of SOVETAKAN AYASTAN Dies (SOVETAKAN AYASTAN, 20 Feb 85) .....	113
KaSSR State Film Committee Board Meets (KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 7 Mar 85) .....	114
KaSSR: Znaniye Society Board Holds Plenum (KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 7 Mar 85) .....	114
Awards to Uzbek Oblast, Rayon, Theater (PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 7 Mar 85) .....	115
Karakalpak Obkom Removes Members for Shortcomings (PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 6 Mar 85) .....	115



Readers Respond to Ukrainian Paper's Survey on Alcohol Abuse (M. Volobuyev; RADYANS'KA UKRAYINA, 16 Feb 85) .....	116
KaSSR: Central Committee Buro Meets (KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 1 Mar 85) .....	117
Returned Lithuanian Exile Hits Emigre Organizations (Vitautas Alseyka Interview; KOMSOMOL'SKAYA PRAVDA, 27 Feb 85) .....	118

INTERNATIONAL

PRAVDA SURVEYS MAIN 39TH UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 84 pp 1, 5

[Article: "Important UN Decisions: Resolution about the celebration of Victory Day -- Guaranteeing each person's right to life -- Isolation of the USA and its allies" in the column "Reports from Abroad"]

[Text] New York (TASS) 15 [Dec]--The 39th Session of the UN General Assembly declared 8 and 9 May 1985 to be days for celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Victory over Fascism in World War II.

The resolution adopted at the session states that celebration of this event of worldwide historical significance should help to mobilize the efforts of the international association in its struggle against Nazism, fascism, and all other ideologies based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror.

The document emphasized that the United Nations came into existence as a result of the victory over Nazism and fascism. In its Charter the nations expressed their determination to spare future generations the calamities of war. At the same time they express deep concern that the advocates of fascism in a number of countries have stepped up their activities, thereby creating a threat to peace and hindering the actualization of man's basic rights and freedoms.

The resolution contains an urgent appeal to all states to adopt effective legal measures aimed at prohibiting the criminal activities of neo-Nazis.

By an overwhelming majority of votes the 39th Session of the UN General Assembly approved a resolution pointing out the urgent necessity of undertaking all possible efforts to strengthen peace and eliminate the threat of war, especially nuclear war.

Curbing the arms race and achieving universal total disarmament will contribute to ensuring the right to life, according to this resolution, which was proposed by the Soviet Union, other Socialist states, and also a number of nonaligned countries.

This decision of the General Assembly was dictated by the recognition that all the horrors of past wars and all the other disasters that befell the people would pale before that which the use of nuclear weapons will entail. Only six Western countries headed by the USA voted against the document.

The international association is making preparations for wide observance of the 25th anniversary of the UN General Assembly's adoption, on the USSR's initiative, of the historic declaration about granting independence to colonial countries and peoples.

In this connection the 39th Session of the UN General Assembly decided to hold a special anniversary meeting at UN Headquarters at the end of next year.

The General Assembly angrily condemned the American-Israeli agreement that is hindering the achievement of peace in the Near East and adopted by an overwhelming majority of votes a number of resolutions concerning the situation in this region.

It pointed out that the "strategic collaboration" between the USA and Israel is encouraging Tel Aviv to pursue an aggressive and expansionist policy, is undermining efforts to establish an all-embracing, just and durable peace in the Near East and is jeopardizing the security of its peoples.

The association of nations once again called for the convocation of an international conference on the Near East. As the discussions showed, a majority of the states support the USSR's proposal concerning the holding of such a conference.

Seven resolutions adopted at the 39th Session of the UN General Assembly contain severe criticism of human rights violations by the Israeli aggressors in the territories they have seized.

The General Assembly "vigorously condemned the creation of new Israeli settlements on Arab territories and the expansion of existing ones and the deportation, expulsion, relocation and exile of the Arab inhabitants."

Israel and the USA again defied the international association. The Israeli delegation voted against all of the documents, and its strategic ally failed to support four of the resolutions and abstained from voting on the remaining three.

The UN General Assembly decried the flagrant violations of human rights in Chile, El Salvador and Guatemala, where reactionary regimes that are hostile to the interests of the people and rely on Washington's support hold power.

The resolution about the situation in Chile points out that the recent declaration of a state of siege by the fascist junta has led to a further intensification of terror and repression.

The resolution about El Salvador notes that the punitive operations of the forces of the ruling regime has led to mass sacrifices among the civilian population. The tragedy of the Salvadoran people is aggravated by the legal tyranny that prevails here despite Washington's widely disseminated statements about the "progress" supposedly achieved in the area of human rights in this country.

The USA voted against the resolutions.

The international association resolutely supports the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), its goals and its activities.

This is stated in a resolution that the 39th Session of the UN General Assembly adopted on the initiative of the developing countries. An overwhelming majority of states voted in support of UNESCO. Only the USA and its closest allies opposed the resolution.

As is well known, the USA has been promoting a hostile campaign against UNESCO, trying to force this authoritative international organizations to repudiate its principled approach to fundamental contemporary problems. The General Assembly's decision testifies to the indignation of the international association at the actions of the USA and its readiness to repulse them with a view to strengthening the entire UN system in the interests of peace and progress.

The UN General Assembly urged the mass media to contribute to the strengthening of peace and international mutual understanding and to the struggle against racism, apartheid and incitement to war.

The resolution that was adopted pointed out the necessity of establishing a new order for international information.

That sort of order would be directed toward strengthening peace, would give to all people an opportunity to participate more actively in political, economic, social and cultural life and would be conducive to the development of mutual understanding and friendship among all states and to respect for human rights.

12731

CSO: 1807/164



INTERNATIONAL

JAPAN'S EXPORT OF DUAL-USE TECHNOLOGY TO U.S. CRITICIZED

OW090633 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 8 Mar 85

[Excerpts] Listeners, the Japanese munitions industry has recently expanded the export of the so-called commodities for dual purposes--civilian goods that can also be used extensively for military purposes. This, in fact, ignores the 1967 Diet resolution on banning the export of weapons and military technology. This resolution has been affirmed on several occasions and supplemented for more rigid implementation.

It is fully obvious that such goods for dual purposes, including heavy-duty trucks, jeeps, helicopters, small aircrafts, rockets for meteorological observations, and many others, can be sufficiently applied for military purposes. Furthermore, the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) has closed its eyes to the export of such commodities as semi-conductors and ICS. With a slight processing, these commodities can be applied to missiles, cannons, or electronic aircraft equipment. A certain high-ranking official of MITI has stated: There is no way to ban the export of commodities produced on commercial basis, even if they are used for military purposes. We cannot control every business transaction of goods that can be used for dual purposes.

According to Japan's intelligence sources, the Mitsubishi Electric Corporation is now developing a new radar system, a much more efficient system than any other radar system in the world, that is capable of catching missiles in flight by evading the enemy's electronic jamming. And the technology of manufacturing such radar equipment is based on a commercial project. In this connection, it is most likely that such products will be added to the list of Japan's export commodities in the future.

Japan and the United States signed an agreement on Japan's transfer of arms and military technology to the United States on 8 November 1983. The signing of this agreement has created a favorable condition for the Japanese munition industry circles and advocates for military buildup to expand production of munitions and intensify their demand on the government to withdraw the ban on the export of weapons and military technology.

The development of carbon fiber and other composite materials is of great interest to the Japanese military authorities. The Toshiba Electric Industry



Company and the Nippon Electric Industry Company are now engaged in developing materials that can absorb electric waves. According to experts, these materials can be used in manufacturing invisible bombers and coating cruise missiles.

What is noteworthy is that all the Japanese industrial products mentioned above can be most effectively applied to the production of weapons to be used in Star Wars. This Star Wars project is a new, dangerous project of the Pentagon's aiming at creating a shield in outer space to guarantee the possibility of launching a nuclear attack on the enemy territories without running the risk of a retaliatory attack.

For example, the heat-resisting ceramic covering material can be applied to the coating of space shuttles and the engines for propulsion rockets. Computers and other extremely high-precision electronic equipment can upgrade the reliability of objects launched into outer space and the precision of missiles' guidance. As the United States plans to produce laser weapons to be used in outer space, it has great interest in Japan's laser generation apparatus.

In commenting on the trend of Japan-U.S. cooperation in the fields of military technology, experts believe a new Japan-U.S. agreement will become a reality mainly in the applied military fields, but not in the purely military field, about which the Japanese people have a most delicate feeling because they are restrained by the Diet's measure on banning the export of weapons and military technology. In other words, the U.S. side intends to obtain Japan's advanced technology that can be applied for military purposes by bypassing the existing ban on the export of weapons and military technology.

Thus, it has become obvious that the Japanese military industry circles have taken every possible measure to make advances into the international market and are attempting to have the peace-oriented constitution revised. By so doing, the merchants of death will gain a free hand in their actions and, furthermore, it will serve as a new step in bringing the Japanese Government and the U.S. imperialism closer together in carrying out the aggressive nuclear strategy. However, this policy is dangerous, above all, to Japan itself, and it will turn Japan into the nuclear hostage of the United States.

CSO: 4105/186

INTERNATIONAL

HIROSHIMA, DRESDEN WW II BOMBING SEEN AS MEANS TO 'SCARE' USSR

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Mar 85 p 5

[Article by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov: "Rehearsal of Hiroshima"]

[Text] On the night of 9-10 March 1945 Tokyo was again transformed into a sea of fire, just as after the "great earthquake" of 1923. A strong underground tremor rocked the Japanese capital in the pre-noon time hour and caused countless fires among the collapsing wooden houses. Another tragedy with a similar number of victims occurred not before noon but after midnight, when a hail of American incendiary bombs fell on the sleeping Japanese City.

In November of 1944, U.S. strategic aircraft began to conduct strikes against Japan from the Mariana Islands. B-29 bombers, which first saw wide use in the Pacific theater of military operations, were considered invulnerable. These "super fortresses" carried out bombing raids from 10,000 meters; at that time the Japanese "Zero" fighters were not able to climb more than 8,000 meters. However, from the military point of view the effectiveness of these flights was low. In the course of four months the B-29's were not even able to knock out even one of the 11 main facilities of the Japanese military-industrial complex such as the aviation plant in Musashino (near Tokyo).

The then commander of the U.S. 20th Air Army, General Curtis LeMay, decided to change over to nighttime bombing from low altitude using primarily not high-explosive but incendiary bombs. On the night of 9-10 March this new tactic was first employed against the thickly populated workers' suburbs in the eastern part of Tokyo.

The operation under the code name "Prayer House" [Molitvennyy dom] began immediately after midnight. Tokyo Bay and the Sumida River glistened silver under the moon, making the city blackout useless. Three air wings with 12 bombers in each dropped the first cannisters with their incendiary mixture on the assigned targets. The fires that broke out joined in a fiery cross, orienting the 300 "Superfortresses" flying along. The closely packed houses of wood and paper blazed up like straw. The alleys at once turned into fiery rivers. Panic-stricken crowds of people ran to the banks of the Sumida River and its tributaries. But even the river water, even the cast-iron spans of the bridges were burning hot from the incredible heat. Fire storms of hurricane strength raged over the city. The air turbulence they caused tossed the American superfortresses so much that the pilots could barely maintain course.

More than 100,000 people died in Tokyo after only that one night. More than a million citizens were without shelter. A quarter of the capital was destroyed all at once. (Amazingly, the Marunouchi region where the headquarters of the largest banks and industrial concerns were located, remained untouched). At the Pentagon they rejoiced. On 11 March, 24 hours after they returned from the operation, the same B-29's were sent to bomb Nagoya. On 13 March they carried out a raid on Osaka and on 17 March they attacked Kobe. Within a week 11,000 tons of incendiary bombs were dropped on the four largest Japanese cities.

However, the strike on Tokyo was the most ruthless. It can only be compared with the barbaric destruction of Dresden. On 13 February 1945 almost 800 English "Lancaster" bombers dropped on this city, filled with refugees, first incendiary and then high-explosive bombs. The next day more than 300 American B-17 "flying fortresses" accompanied by 200 fighters completed the destruction of Dresden, known for its historical monuments, hardly for its military installations.

With the raid on Dresden, notes the West German newspaper FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, Churchill wanted to demonstrate the power of Anglo-American aviation not only to defeated Germany. Evidently, he wanted to let the Russians know that they would have to take this strength into account in the post-war European settlement. Having been U.S. president only eight weeks, Truman was immediately included in what Churchill had long been planning. Between the conflagration of Dresden and the atomic explosion that reduced Hiroshima to ashes, there is, apparently, a political connection....

The Austrian VOLKSTIMME expresses this thought more specifically. The incredible strikes against Dresden and Hiroshima, the newspaper notes, pursued the same objective: to frighten the Soviet Union. They [the strikes] were pre-ludes to the "cold war" the beginning of which had already been foreseen by the governments of London and Washington.

It remains to add that the February tragedy of Dresden was repeated in March in Tokyo. Operation "Thunderbolt" [Udar Groma] was a prototype of operation "Prayer House." Neither one was dictated by military necessity and each led to the death of more than 100,000 civilians. In essence, both Dresden and Tokyo were rehearsals for Hiroshima--frightful acts bearing an ever more distinct anti-Soviet direction.

CSO: 1807/233

## INTERNATIONAL

### PAPERS FROM JOURNAL ROUNDTABLE ON COUNTERPROPAGANDA

Moscow NAUCHNYY KOMMUNIZM in Russian No 5, Sep-Oct 84 pp 97-136

[Unattributed report on 1984 roundtable discussion held in the editorial offices of the journal NAUCHNYY KOMMUNIZM, including the following journal writers: V.D. Granov, M.Kh. Farukshin, A.V. Losik, V.A. Nikitin, V.S. Pazenok, Ye.A. Anufriyev, V.F. Khalipov, M.P. Skirdo, Yu.V. Yeremin, M.Kh. Ganiyeva, T.R. Kondratkov, A.N. Kochetov, L.V. Topchiy and V.Glagolev (statements published in abridged versions), and E.A. Arab-ogly, V.G. Antonenko, L.V. Metelitsa, L.Ye. Serebryakov and B.A. Shabad (statements not published): "Aggravation of the Ideological Struggle and Urgent Questions of Counterpropaganda"]

[Text] The meeting was opened by the deputy chief editor of NAUCHNYY KOMMUNIZM, professor V.F. Glagolev. At its 26th Congress and at CPSU Central Committee plenums, he said, the CPSU has drawn the special attention of communists, party organs and all social scientists, and workers in the educational system and mass information media, to the need to intensify the struggle against bourgeois ideology. The successful development of the world socialist system and of the present-day world revolutionary process is resulting in a growing anger on the part of the imperialists. As a counterweight to the ideology of Marxism-Leninism and the peaceful foreign policy of the countries of the socialist community, the reactionary forces of imperialism, first and foremost U.S. imperialism, have unleashed anticommunist propaganda that is unprecedentedly intense and acute. As was noted at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum, a struggle is taking place between two diametrically opposed world outlooks and two political courses--socialism and imperialism. The future of mankind depends largely on the outcome of this struggle.

The campaign of slander unleashed by imperialism, led by the United States, against the USSR and the other socialist countries and against the communist, workers' and national liberation movements serves for imperialism as a screen to hide its arms race and its preparations for thermonuclear war. "The class enemy," K.U. Chernenko stressed in his report to the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum, "is openly stating his intention to liquidate the socialist system. President Reagan has called for a new 'crusade' against communism. And imperialism sees 'psychological warfare' as one of the main means of achieving its goals... This is why it is necessary to develop aggressive counterpropaganda work not only in the international arena but also inside the country" ("Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 14-15 June 1983," Moscow, 1983, page 52).



The journal NAUCHNYY KOMMUNIZM systematically publishes materials unmasking the ideology and policy of imperialism. In the journal's permanent "The Present Ideological Struggle" section and in other sections, articles with a counterpropaganda content are published regularly. However, from the standpoint of present-day demands this is little enough. The journal's editorial board and editorial office therefore decided to conduct a "roundtable" dealing specially with questions of intensifying counterpropaganda. Eminent Soviet scholars working in the field of scientific communism and other social scientists participate in this discussion.

The editorial board considers that at the present time all articles in the journal should have a counterpropaganda thrust. The best method of dealing with bourgeois ideology is to counterpose our ideas, the policy of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties and their aims and tasks, and the communist ideals of politics against the theoretical and sociopolitical concepts of capitalism. In this connection it is desirable that any statements touch on the most acute problems associated with counterpropaganda, and that opinions be expressed on the theme for articles as proposed by the editorial office.

Finally, it must be taken into account that bourgeois propaganda is aimed largely at the youth of the USSR and of other socialist countries, first and foremost at the student body. It is from this youth that the socialist intelligentsia and the leaders of the various elements of the national economy are formed. The strategic aim of bourgeois propaganda is to sow among youth doubt in the correctness of Marxism-Leninism and the policies of the communist and workers' parties, and to weaken the labor enthusiasm of young men and women and the defensive potential of the countries of the socialist community. Our journal is largely aimed at the student youth and it helps in its indoctrination. "Further improvement in the indoctrination of the rising generation," it emphasizes in the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Further Improving Party Leadership over the Komsomol and Enhancing its Role in the Communist Indoctrination of Youth," "should be regarded as a most important party, state and national matter.... It is a question of reliably insuring the future of our motherland" (PRVADA, 7 Jul 84). It would therefore be useful to hear suggestions on the range of problems covering counterpropaganda purely for youth, and on methods of counterpropaganda aimed at youth.

Such is the range of problems about which I would like to hear the opinion of those who speak.

Doctor of philosophical sciences, professor V.D. Granov. The Features of Anti-Communism in the thirties.

In recent years anticommunism has acquired certain new features, resulting from the further deepening of the contradictions in capitalist society and activation of the most aggressive imperialist circles. These circles are attempting to halt the process of the defection from imperialism by more and more states, lessen the internal crisis of capitalism, and seize the historical initiative from the forces of socialism and achieve a strategic turnabout in the development of world events in their own favor. The solution of this task is thought of as the establishment of a world dictatorship by the United States



as the latest version of the "pax Americana." It is a question of a general ideological mobilization of the forces of world reaction and their unification around the aggressive policy of the United States.

The concepts of "deideologization," the "obsolete nature of ideology" and so forth, popular in the Sixties and early Seventies, are no longer current. True, they are still preached with respect to the socialist countries in order to undermine the positions of Marxism-Leninism. But they take a back seat in the mass information aimed at the public at large in the West.

Now the concept of "reideologization" reigns. Reagan, who astonishes even Americans, who are used to anything, with the lacunae in his education, is notwithstanding named as the most ideological U.S. President in postwar years because he has proclaimed in the most open and class-revealed form the global ideological slogans of imperialism. Once more the task has been openly set of organizing a "crusade against communism." It is Reagan who has proposed that "Marxism-Leninism be consigned to the trash can of history" and that "the spirit of capitalism be reborn throughout the world"; precisely Reagan who has unleashed a propaganda campaign, unprecedented in scale, against our country and all progressive forces--a campaign that in terms of its incandescence and its crudeness is comparable to the "cold war" times of the late Forties and early Fifties, and that in terms of financial expenditures exceeds many times over the scale of the "cold war" during those years.

Today, anti-Sovietism--the core of anticommunism--permeates the entire content of bourgeois propaganda. The idea of the "Soviet military threat" is being spread. With its help the imperialists would like, first, to put an end to the growth of our country's authority worldwide and to discredit socialism; second to rally the United States' allies about it and keep them on a firm leash; and third, to sow the seeds of alienation between the USSR and the nonaligned countries, frighten them with the specter of a "threat from Moscow" and hide and justify behind the smoke screen of the anti-Soviet campaign imperialism's actual aggression against the liberated countries.

The ideological attacks against socialism are being launched along the entire front. No matter what the subject, the enemy has but one purpose: to undermine our most valued property and the source of our strength--the unity of Soviet society. To this end attempts are made to set father against son, the older generation against the rising generation, one stratum of Soviet society (for example, the intelligentsia) against another.

But the bourgeois ideologues spend most effort on trying to weaken the unity of the party and the people. They understand that the CPSU is the great binding force that first and foremost has prepared and insured the worldwide-historic achievement of socialism and our multinational state. They therefore go to any length to weaken the authority of our party, both within the country and in the world arena.

The theoretical "justification" for the open political and economic blackmail offered by the apologists of capitalism and pursued by the reactionary circles of imperialism, and its arms race and its military methods in dealing with progressive forces could be called the militarization of the ideology of

anticommunism. New doctrines and belligerent slogans appear, such as "first nuclear strike," "limited" or, oppositely, "protracted" nuclear war, and so forth. They want to force people to reconcile themselves to an unrestricted arms race and become accustomed to the idea of the inevitability of nuclear war. Using all means possible they fan war hysteria; and one attempt after another is made that proves that the U.S. government ignores international law, considers that it is not bound by international treaties, and disregards world public opinion.

"International terrorism" has been raised to the status of state policy by the U.S. administration. But to hide this, the doctrine of "the struggle against international terrorism," which tries to place national liberation movements outside the law and on this basis justify their armed suppression at any point in the world, has been born. The present U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz demands that the West switch to "active struggle against terrorism" by means of the use of "U.S. military force." He considers that the United States has a "complete moral right" to resort to military force in order to support its own bankrupt servitors.

As a result of the weakening of the internal positions of the West and the dashing of hopes that the scientific and technical revolution would automatically extricate the capitalist economy from the labyrinth of contradictions, the most aggressive circles of monopoly capitalism and their political parties have been faced with the need to find an answer to the situation that has been created. Thus, the neoconservatives have appeared. Their policy is permeated through and through with anticommunism. They have become the expression of the narrow-class interests of monopoly capital.

The neoconservatives oppose the concept of the "state of general prosperity"--a concept founded in the political and ideological declarations of governments in the West during the Sixties and Seventies. They think that a restructuring of the economy will exacerbate the economic crisis. But at the same time they count on economic crisis to stimulate competition between capitalists and between workers; that the strongest and most viable of the firms will survive, which will insure a new upsurge with subsequent stability and the burgeoning of capitalist society; and that unemployment sharpens competition between workers and thus improves labor discipline, forces workers to accept lower wages, weakens the trade union and working movements and strengthens the power of big capital.

During the period of the Reagan administration "coarseness" and "primitivization" have been typical of anticommunist propaganda. The most cynical slander and fiction is today used openly and in the kind of stream that has not been seen since the days of unbridled "cold war." For example, the campaign for "human rights" was previously veiled in an ostentatious concern for the "individual." But the present campaign "against terrorism" is being undertaken openly and impudently.

Of course, it does not follow from this that this kind of propaganda should not be taken seriously. The present "primitivization" of anticommunism does not represent a return to "cave-man" anticommunism. Today's anticommunism has imbibed all previous experience in the struggle against real socialism and the entire revolutionary movement.

In the struggle against anticommunism it is essential to assess the overall situation in the world soberly and not to underestimate the enemy. But at the same time it is necessary to know that the fury of imperialism's propaganda attacks is dictated not by its growing strength but by its defeats and its general crisis.

It is precisely fear of Marxist-Leninist ideology and its growing sphere of influence that is forcing the bourgeois ideologues to turn more actively to the problems that are being resolved during the course of progressive social development (these are problems of classes and the relationships between them, the socialist perspective on the modern world, the inevitable collapse of capitalism and so forth). The number of bourgeois studies on these questions has increased. And this is proof of the defensive posture of the bourgeois ideologues.

At the same time Marxist researchers should reveal more deeply, using concrete examples, the position put forward by the 26th CPSU Congress: "There is no country or group of countries, no matter what its ideological bent, that has not experienced the influence of socialism to some degree or another" (Materials of the 26th CPSU Congress, Moscow, 1981, p 79).

The main thing in the ideological struggle in the world arena is that Marxism-Leninism holds the strategic initiative. The best way to convince people of this is through the skillful, intelligible propaganda of Marxist-Leninist teaching and the successes of real socialism and its indisputable advantages over capitalism.

Doctor of philosophical sciences, professor M.Kh. Farukshin. Features of the Ideology of Present-day Anticommunism and the Tasks of Counterpropaganda.

The present ideological situation in the world is largely determined by the fact that in the late Seventies and early Eighties in a number of the leading capitalist countries, primarily the United States, rightist, very conservative, aggressive groupings of the ruling class came to power, and they switched to a frontal attack on Marxism-Leninism and real socialism, and to malicious, belligerent anticommunism. They are trying to transform ideological differences into military-political confrontation and use the ideological factor to worsen interstate relations. As the bedrock of this policy imperialism is mobilizing its ideological and propaganda means and trying to organize against the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community a regular information-propaganda intervention.

One feature of imperialism's present course against the USSR and the other socialist countries is that the shameless anticommunism being used, for example, by the Reagan administration, is being combined with refined, veiled anticommunism, while direct opposition to socialism is combined with attempts to undermine it from within.

The Reagan administration has propounded the doctrines of "limited" and "protracted" nuclear war and talks much about a massive first nuclear strike, while at the same time, as shown by events in Poland in 1980-1981, it encourages internal counterrevolutionary forces, setting the goal of a staged "dismantling" of socialism from within, beginning with the institutions of power. Statements



about a "crusade" against communism and threats to consign Marxism-Leninism to the trash can of history are combined with intrigues and recommendations for another kind of socialism as an alternative to real socialism.

The conceptual arsenal of the conservative, militarist forces also contains the theory of pluralism, which has always been considered the ideological slogan of the neoliberal circles of the bourgeoisie, social reformism and right revisionism. The neoconservatives also regard propaganda of this theory as a means of the bourgeois rebirth of socialism. Thus, U.S. secretary of state G. Shultz stated in the U.S. Foreign Relations Committee that "Because of our commitment to peace we consider it our duty to work for the gradual evolution of the Soviet system toward a more pluralist political and economic system." (PRAVDA 18 Jul 83).

The unique anticommunist course of imperialism here outlined has also been reflected in bourgeois propaganda. In particular, having armed themselves with the coarsest and most primitive stock phrases of anticommunism, bourgeois specialists in the field of the "spiritual industry" are also using more veiled theoretical constructs. It is indicative that present-day bourgeois Sovietology contains no calls to abandon the concepts that were adapted for the struggle against socialism under the conditions of relaxation of international tension. On the contrary, calls are made for the integration of different approaches to the study of the Soviet system (see, for example, A. Borcke's "Significance and Problems of Macro-Political Analysis: The Case of Soviet Studies." Cologne, 1980).

Thus, whereas during "cold war" times the supporters of coarse forms of anticommunism set the tone among the Sovietologists, and during the years of detente the so-called flexible, masked forms of anti-Sovietism dominated, now a unique interaction is observed between open and veiled forms of anti-Sovietism. The traditions of pseudo-objectivity developed among Sovietologists during the years following the "cold war" have today not only not disappeared but, on the contrary, have become an essential component in their quests. In other words, the increased belligerence and anti-Soviet pointedness of present-day Sovietology has in no way made it primitive.

One feature of the ideological struggle--the deepening polarization of ideological currents and the positions of the class forces--is associated with the intensified opposition between socialism and capitalism. The ideological systems opposing Marxism-Leninism contain many differences, stemming from their class essence, content and functions. However, on the soil of the struggle against real socialism and Marxist-Leninist teaching they are becoming closer. In other words, they have a fully defined common denominator--their anticommunist thrust. Anticommunism is not simply one of the many directions or currents in bourgeois ideology but its very core and the common function of bourgeois and petty bourgeois teachings since the moment that Marxism came into being.

The display of integration of ideological perceptions incompatible with scientific communism within the framework of militant bourgeois ideology serves to interweave increasingly closely and virtually merge openly bourgeois doctrines and concepts of the reformist and revisionist ilk. It becomes increasingly difficult to define the differences in the positions of the bourgeois ideologues, the reformists and the revisionists, particularly with regard to real socialism.

The features of present-day anticommunism must be considered when organizing and conducting ideological and mass-political work and counterpropaganda. The latter should be effected both along the line of deepening work on urgent problems of the the present ideological struggle and on the plane of determining concrete measures to improve its effectiveness. One such measure is comprehensive analysis of the basic directions and methods of anticommunist propaganda about the socialist countries. This makes it possible to establish what this propaganda is counting on in each specific case and what it is trying to achieve, and what its effect is on different social groups. In my opinion, effective ways of improving ideological mass-political work are the study of the conceptual ideas that have been taken up by present-day bourgeois propaganda from the theoretical arsenal of the bourgeoisie; analysis of the main stereotypes created on the basis of these ideas that bourgeois propaganda is trying to introduce into the consciousness of the populations in the socialist countries; and the development and extensive use in counterpropaganada work of a methodology to unmask them.

One thing that seems important in our research work and in counterpropaganda is to extend the scope and scales in the use of the comparative method in order to show the historical advantages of socialism and reveal everything that is common to the countries of the world socialist community; and also to compare and contrast the socialist and bourgeois ways of life. In the ideological struggle it is essential to intensify criticism of capitalism as a social system and of the apologetic constructs of present-day anticommunism.

One important question in counterpropaganda is predicting the ideological struggle, that is, defining the problems that can be brought to the foreground and the methods to which the class enemy is most likely to resort. Scientifically substantiated prediction in this field is one condition for insuring the offensive in the ideological struggle since it creates a basis for outstripping bourgeois ideology and propaganda in influencing the public consciousness.

One of the most important tasks in our counterpropaganada is now to forestall the hostile camapign that is undoubtedly being prepared on large scales by bourgeois propaganda in connection with the new edition of the CPSU Program. There is no doubt that the new edition of the CPSU Program will exert a powerful ideological-political effect on all aspects of life both for the Soviet people and for the peoples of other countries. As K.U. Chernenko has noted, it "will have broad international repurcussions. And it is not only our friends who will discuss it. This means that when working on the draft for this most important party document it must be taken into account that it will play a major role in the worldwide ideological struggle." (K.U. Cherenenko. "Speech at the 25 April 1984 Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Commission To Prepare the New Edition of the CPSU Program." Moscow, 1984, p 14).

Of course, it cannot be excluded that in the bourgeois and other interpretations and assessments of the new edition of the CPSU Program that are hostile to us new methods used by the falsifiers will appear. Nevertheless, I think that the basis of such interpretations and assessments will be the ideological baggage that the bourgeois Sovietologists have been using in the Eighties. This baggage is well known and this makes it possible to foresee the basic directions and methods of bourgeois propaganda and to develop appropriate counterpropaganda work in good time.



The CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum underscored the need to create within the country a unified, well thought-out system of counterpropaganda that takes into account the specific features of the different social groups. One important target of counterpropaganda activity is the student youth. The organization of effective counterpropaganda requires deep study of the student body and of the opinions formed within that body on the topical questions of social life, the dominant sources of information for students and so forth.

In this connection it is advisable to create within the system of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education regional sociological laboratories on the problems of counterpropaganda among the student youth. These laboratories should be assigned the task of studying the effectiveness of counterpropaganda among the student body and of issuing recommendations on improving it, compiling methodology for the organization of counterpropaganda work in the VUZ's, developing measures to strengthen the counterpropaganda thrust in the teaching of the social sciences and the other sciences in the VUZ's and secondary specialized educational establishments, and coordinating studies on the problems of counterpropaganda and conducting scientific-practical seminars and conferences.

Candidate of historical sciences, docent A.V. Losik. The Place of Counterpropaganda in the Ideological Activity of the CPSU.

The party's ideological work includes the following: constant development of Marxist-Leninist theory, propaganda of communist ideology, and the struggle against bourgeois and revisionist ideology and propaganda. Consequently, counterpropaganda is an integral part of ideological work and the counterpropaganda thrust permeates the entire content of party ideological activity.

Under present-day conditions counterpropaganda is being moved increasingly to the foreground in the ideological activity of the CPSU. This is associated, first, with the intensification of the ideological struggle in the world arena, which has assumed a global character. At the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum K.U. Chernenko said: "We are dealing with attempts to organize against us a real information-propaganda intervention and to transform radio and television into a weapon for interfering in the internal affairs of states and to conduct subversive actions." (Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 14-15 June 1983, page 52). The main thing in the party's ideological activity is to unmask these plans of the enemy and to neutralize the effect of his propaganda. Successes in party political-indoctrination work are bound up inseparably with the skill to struggle effectively against the policy, ideology and propaganda of anticommunism.

Second, this is dictated by the requirement to further strengthen the offensive nature of Marxist-Leninist ideology in the present-day ideological fight. "Strengthening the positions of world socialism and of all progressive forces creates favorable conditions for the building of communism and for developing the ideological offensive against imperialism and hegemony, militarism and reaction. ("On Further Improving Ideological and Political-Indoctrination Work." CPSU Central Committee decree. Moscow, 1979, p 8).

Third, it is explained by the substantial change in the ideological situation within the country, associated primarily with the growing level of education, culture and requirements of the Soviet people; with the entry into life of a rising generation, taking place under the conditions of developed socialism; with the expanding amount of information and contacts between peoples; and so forth. Thus, for example, whereas during all the prewar years about 100,000 foreigners visited our country, each year about 5 million foreign tourists now visit it, and about 4-4.5 million Soviet tourists travel abroad each year (see ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 41, 1983 p 8).

It is connected, fourth, with the growing complexity of the nature of the ideological confrontation, wherein "psychological warfare unprecedented in scale and shamelessness is being waged against the Soviet Union and the socialist countries." (Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 14-15 1983, p 68). As is known, this represents an aggregate of subversive methods and means, sabotages and other measures to influence the socialist countries, and also mass indoctrination of people with the aid of manipulative propaganda. Accordingly, as was emphasized by the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum, "we must have a well-thought-out, unified system of counterpropaganda that is dynamic and effective" (Ibid., p 7). The public organizations, state institutions and organs of mass information and propaganda and others are all making their contribution to this work.

Counterpropaganda should rely on the principles and traditions that have withstood the test of time. It is necessary to develop and perfect the activity of the counterpropaganda system and raise it to the level of present-day requirements. K.U. Chernenko notes that "the main thing in its work is to graphically reveal the advantages of the Soviet way of life and unmask profoundly and convincingly the rotten 'values' of the bourgeois consciousness, analyse specifically the propaganda hostile to socialism, and coordinate preventive counterpropaganda measures." (K.U. Chernenko. "A Matter for the Entire Party, for Every Communist." KOMMUNIST No 15, 1983, p 30)

Within the counterpropaganda system a special place is occupied by the party organizations. Since counterpropaganda is regarded as an important direction in ideological activity, the party organizations should carry it out "systematically, with the proper competence, and with consideration of the concrete situation in the various parts of the country and the degree of influence exercised by bourgeois propaganda on given groups within the population" ("To Raise the Level of Work Among the Masses." PRAVDA 30 Nov 1981). In recent years the party organizations have begun to pay more attention to the study of public opinion, analysis of the specific ideological situation taking shape in any given collective, propaganda work and the preparation of information materials, special methodological work and aids on various counterpropaganda questions, and they are planning and organizing this work more purposefully..... For example, the Estonian party organization's counterpropaganda system includes specialized groups that study and evaluate the ideological situation, namely the Estonian Communist Party Bureau Commission on Questions of Counterpropaganda, or the party gorkom and raykom commissions or sections dealing with questions of counterpropaganda; and so forth (see PRAVDA 3 Apr 1984).

The special groups of counterpropaganda workers selected from the most experienced lecturers, political information workers and propagandists created within the party committees have well justified themselves. These kinds of groups, and also reference and information centers and methodological councils, have been set up, for example, in the CPSU raykoms and large party committees in Moscow. Counterpropaganda departments and sections are operating in the central committees of the republic communist parties, individual obkoms and kraykoms, the CPSU Moscow Gorkom, and in some of the large party committees. Sections for dealing with bourgeois ideology as part of the party committee ideological commissions have recommended themselves well. (see N.M. Keyzerov. "Being Aggressive in the Struggle Against Bourgeois Ideology." Moscow, 1983, p 35) Combined political days on counterpropaganda subjects are now being held extensively; and methodological councils on questions of dealing with bourgeois ideology, and also special methodological study rooms for counterpropaganda, are being organized at houses of political enlightenment.

In general counterpropaganda activity includes the following: the selection of ideological cadres and their training in the ways and methods of counterpropaganda; organizing the system of current and comprehensive information for the ideological aktiv and the public; studying the ideological situation and public opinion and determining the sources, channels and forms by which anticommunist propaganda penetrates; work to coordinate the efforts of all organs engaged in counterpropaganda and active cooperation in this field with the communist parties of other countries; studying and disseminating historical and contemporary experience gained in the militant struggle against anticommunism, including experience gained in the fraternal socialist countries; systematic work to improve the forms, means and methods of counterpropaganda activity and determine the degree of its effectiveness; comprehensive analysis of conditions in the international situation and the nature, content and features of bourgeois propaganda and its strategy and tactics; predicting ideological sabotage by the enemy and adopting appropriate preventive countermeasures; drawing up practical recommendations for party committees, the mass information media and the ideological aktiv.

An important place in counterpropaganda is occupied by the mass information media, which in recent times have considerably strengthened the counterpropaganda direction of their statements and diversified their forms. Central television has started regular transmission of "Today in the World," a special literary counterpropaganda thrust of the "Disarmament. Who Is Against It?" type (Moscow, 1983) has appeared, and so forth. The programs "Studio Nine" and "International Panorama," television reportage from the "hot spots" of the world and "crisis" regions in the program "Time," journalistic television films about the American way of life, Zionism and so forth enjoy enormous popularity among millions of television viewers. However, as K.U. Cherenenko has emphasized, "the task of the day is to improve the content and current nature of television information programs. In the recently adopted CPSU Central Committee decree on this question specific measures are outlined. A morning information program has been introduced, along with additional newscasts throughout the day. Youth is addressed through a new weekly television program with a counterpropaganda thrust, while children and teenagers have their regular journalistic information program." (K.U. Cherenko. "A Matter for the Entire Party, for Every Communist." KOMMUNIST No 15, 1983, p 28).



Much of the material in the central and local press contains a propaganda charge unmasking the ideological sabotage of imperialism, and the factual material shows all the falseness of the campaigns and myths being spread by western propaganda.

Thus, counterpropaganda is occupying an increasingly important place in the party's ideological activity and becoming a special function of party work and of all the means used for the communist indoctrination of the masses. And this, in turn, places stringent requirements on the level and quality of work in the various elements of the counterpropaganda system.

Doctor of philosophical sciences V.A. Nikitin. The Features of Present-day Opportunism and Certain Questions of Counterpropaganda.

Under the conditions of exacerbation of the ideological struggle in the international arena the need is growing for further improvement in the critical analysis of the ideology of opportunism and in effectively rebuffing it. Among the most important directions of propaganda, the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum named the development in Soviet people of the ability "to oppose the ideological sabotage of the class enemy and of opportunist and revisionist attacks against real socialism." (Materials of the CPSU Central Committee 14-15 June 1983, p 74).

The deepening ideological antagonism and the polarization of ideological stances taking place against this background are constricting the framework within which opportunism can maneuver ideologically and forcing it to evolve on the ideological-political plane. These factors must be constantly studied and considered when conducting counterpropaganda work.

In our days the most typical forms of opportunism are revisionism and social reformism. They have a ideological-genetic, theoretical-methodological and social-functional affinity. Relationships between revisionism and social reformism have always been the relationships of communicating vessels. The same is true today, with the sole difference that priority is now given most often to social reformism. Many of the sociopolitical anticommunist and anti-Soviet concepts of today's revisionists are a variation of social reformist ideas on "democratic socialism." At the same time the identification of social reformism and revisionism contradicts the Marxist-Leninist principle of specific-historical analysis of ideological-political trends and lowers the effectiveness of the struggle against opportunism. The fact that revisionism represents views hostile to Marxism-Leninism and operates within the international communist movement, while social reformism is the opportunist ideology and policy of social-democrat, socialist and labor parties usually within the socialist internationale, requires a specific approach when criticizing the various forms of opportunism.

The features of present-day opportunism must also be taken into account in counterpropaganda work. Thus, for example, present-day revisionism is a very broad ideological symbiosis of the views of Bernsteinism, anarchism, Trotskyism, "left" radicalism, "neo-Marxism," and bourgeois liberalism. Its leaders, who in the late Sixties advanced the slogan "Back to Marx," are ready to remove from "real" Marxism not only F. Engels and V.I. Lenin but even K. Marx himself.

In contrast to revisionists of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, who had no stomach for an open clash against the dialectic of socialism, today's revisionists preach metaphysics and speak out directly as ideologues of counter-revolution; and in this they often close ranks with imperialist reaction. The difference between right and "left" revisionism is becoming more relative, and so forth.

Even greater, although also ambiguous changes have also taken place in recent years in the ideology and policy of social reformism. The deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, the development of the world revolutionary process, and the growing role and influence of real socialism and of the forces of peace and democracy, on the one hand, and the increased threat of world nuclear war and the arms race, on the other, have forced the leaders and ideologues of social democracy to amend their ideology and policy. This is seen in particular in the foreign policy field. As is known, for many years they gave virtually their full support to the foreign policy of the United States and the NATO countries and were accomplices in some of imperialism's foreign policy actions. Since the late Seventies, however, and particular in these last years many social democratic leaders and theoreticians have started to demand an end to the arms race and to speak out against the deployment of U.S. missiles in West Europe; and so forth. Whereas in the Sixties and the first half of the Seventies realistic positions on questions of foreign policy were mainly typical for the individual socialist parties of Europe, in the Eighties the SPD, the Socialist Party of Austria and social democracy in the Scandinavian countries are distinguished by their activeness and a certain consistency on these same problems.

Certain changes have also taken place in the forms of anticommunist propaganda in present-day social democracy. Thus, the well-known social democrat from the FRG, P. Glotz has stated that under present conditions it is essential to abandon the hysterical form of anticommunism, which is presented under the pretext that the participation of social democracy in the peace movement somehow can transform it into a "tool of the Soviets." He writes that "the ideological fronts have not disappeared but been moved to a secondary place compared with questions of the danger of war and the problem of mankind's survival" and that "there is no need for additional anticommunism." (DIE NEUE GESELLSCHAFT, H4, 1983, pp 267, 269, 271)

This, of course, in no way means that anticommunism is disappearing from the ideology and policy of the social democrats in the FRG or from international social democracy. As the 16th Congress of the Socialist Internationale (April 1983) showed, social democracy continues to push its doctrine of "democratic socialism" as an alternative first and foremost to communism (see DIE NEUE GESELLSCHAFT H 5, 1983, pp 429-430). The accent of the propaganda has changed but not the essence of anticommunism. As before, social democracy is a defender of the capitalist system.

The CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum focuses the VUZ social scientists on the following: first, to provide a deeper and better-argued criticism of opportunism during the course of social science studies; second, to organize more extensive special courses on critical analysis of the various kinds and forms of opportunism; third, to create a unified program of extracurricular work to develop in every VUZ graduate the ability not only to conduct educational



but also counterpropaganda work in the collective in which he will be working. Perhaps it is worth considering the development and introduction in VUZ's of a course on "Current Issues in the History, Theory and Practice of the Ideological Struggle of the CPSU and the International Communist Movement Against Bourgeois Ideology and Opportunism."

Doctor of philosophical sciences professor V.S. Pazenok. The Failure of Sovietological Falsifications of the Developed Socialist Society.

Anti-Sovietism has now become an integral part of the ideology and policy of the monopoly bourgeoisie. The successes of the world's first worker state, which has now reached the stage of mature socialism, gives joy to its friends throughout the world but instills a mortal fear into its class enemies. The developed socialist society demonstrates most fully the humanist possibilities of the new social order, which has strengthened many times over the ideological influence of socialism on the consciousness of people throughout the world and evoked in them a lively interest in the theory and practice of the building of socialism and communism. Developed socialism is a convincing example of the just resolution of social questions, including one of the most thorny, namely the national question.

The Soviet Union helps the peoples who have set out on the road of building a new society. Within the framework of the countries of the socialist community a qualitatively new type of civilization is being gradually established. Through their consistent, firm foreign policy aimed at curbing international militarism and ending the arms race, the USSR and the other socialist countries are fettering the aggressive plans and intentions of the "hawks" from across the ocean, and they are the main guarantees of peace in the world. This is why the theory and practice of developed socialism and the experience gained in the USSR in building developed socialism have become the object of furious attacks by anticommunist forces.

By selecting the Soviet Union as the main target of its attacks imperialist propaganda is pursuing a number of interconnected aims: to influence the consciousness of Soviet people and shatter their devotion to communist ideals; to "dismantle" the economic, sociopolitical and spiritual foundations of Soviet society; to undermine the unity of the countries of the socialist community and proletarian socialist internationalism; and to frighten the liberated countries with the bugaboo of anti-Sovietism and to turn from socialism the people living under the conditions of capitalism.

By trying to compromise and besmirch socialism, which has now achieved "finished forms" (V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works Vol 36, p 65), the anticommunist ideologues would like thereby to deny the very idea of socialism, substantiate capitalism's superiority as a more "efficient" economic and social order, and win through in the historical clash with socialism.

The philosophical--world-outlook basis of bourgeois Sovietology is an idealistic social philosophy whose main features are denial of the objective law-governed patterns in social life, denial of the possibility of recognizing the essence of social processes, the idea of multiple factors in social life (mnogofaktornost')

and so forth. Today's bourgeois Sovietologists pay special attention to the methodology of social pluralism and relativism, enabling the bourgeois theoreticians to give out their various flights of fancy as "theories" and to construct a scientificlike anticommunism. Various "models" of Soviet society are created on the basis of pluralism and relativism.

One organic part of the latest Sovietological methodology is the comparative method (comparativism). This method is convenient for today's Sovietologists. Thus, by comparing the society of developed socialism and the society of industrially developed capitalism in the field of economics, production and technology the Sovietologists try to prove the growing convergence of these two different types of social order, which is allegedly resulting in their movement toward a single "postindustrial" society (the "convergence" concept). Having selected a different system for comparison in, say, the sociopolitical or spiritual field, they try to show their growing divergence (the "divergence" concept). The comparative methodology is not rational since it ignores the qualitative aspect of the systems compared and the specific nature of the law-governed patterns functioning within them. The comparative method is unable to reflect the different socioeconomic essence of socialism and capitalism, the different goals of social material and spiritual production, or the fundamentally different characteristics of people's ways of life.

The Sovietological methodology is permeated with a social-class, anticommunist "sentiment." [zadannost'] K. Marx's words to the effect that in bourgeois social science "disinterested scientific investigations yield their place to fights between hired hack writers, and dispassionate scientific investigations are replaced by a prejudged, obsequious apologetic " are still topical. (K. Marx and F. Engels. Works, 2d edition, Vol 23, p 17) Denial of socialism is typical of the ideologies of capitalism (K. Popper's concept of the "closed society," H. Kahn's "totalitarian society," R. Reagan's ideas on the "anomalous nature of socialism," and so forth). Set in the foundation of Sovietological investigation, this kind of setting yields nothing except various versions of the Sovietological interpretations of the theory and practice of developed socialism, in which the essence of Soviet society and its economic, sociopolitical, ideological-ethical and spiritual foundations are prejudged and deliberately falsified. Superficially all these concepts are contradictory, but they are united in their profoundly bourgeois theoretical and sociopolitical essence.

In our opinion, somewhat arbitrarily the following Sovietological directions can be distinguished in the interpretation of the theory and practice of developed socialism: "ideological," "convergence," "presentational" and "negativist" (nihilist).

The essence of the "ideological" direction is seen in the attempts made by Sovietologists to discredit the very concept of "developed socialism" and to deny it the status of a scientific category expressing a concrete social reality. Representatives of this direction (A. Evans, (G. Reshetar), (Yu. Marin) and others) would like to prove that developed socialism is allegedly an arbitrary category, a purely ideological term, and a propaganda method. In a spirit of extreme subjectivism they also interpret other basic concepts of developed socialism. The main flaw in these kinds of assertions is that the Sovietologists

are trying to interpret the concept of developed socialism and actual Soviet society itself from positions of extreme subjectivism, in a spirit of neopositivist principles, according to which no law-governed patterns of development exist in a society while the concepts of the social sciences have no objective content. The unsoundness of this methodology is convincingly shown by the theory and practice of scientific communism and the very fact of real socialism's progress.

The "convergence" direction is characterized by the fact that its representatives (T. (Freitgat), (G. Landes) and others) try to show that the mature socialist society is allegedly nothing other than the theoretical equivalent of the developed "industrial society," the "shaped society" and so forth. They suppose that one typical sign of this is the transition from the "extensive stage" to the "intensive phase of the industrial society." The theoretical unsoundness of these assertions lies in the failure to understand the terms "degree of development" and "maturity," which are used extensively in the social sciences. As is known, when characterizing imperialism, V.I. Lenin called it the highest phase of capitalism. In a number of his works he also uses the expression "developed capitalism" (see, for example, V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works, Vol 25, p 264). However, mature socialism differs fundamentally from industrially developed capitalism. Internal unity of all aspects of public life, political stability, the dynamism of the social system, and ideological-political monolithism are part and parcel of developed socialism, in short, a high degree of socio-economic and spiritual integrity. The countries of capitalism, however, do not possess this integrity. A marked exacerbation of antagonistic contradictions, the instability of economic and political structures, the growing social "neediness" of the individual and his growing alienation from bourgeois society are typical features of the social portrait of the United States and the other leading capitalist countries.

The "presentational" direction ((V. Leongard) and others) is based on a version of the so-called prolonged (prolonged) socialism, to the effect that the concept of developed socialism and CPSU strategy aimed at its comprehensive perfection signifies abandonment of the building of communism and the "prolongation" of socialism in its present form for a long period that cannot be predicted. This is shameless speculation on the complicated and prolonged path leading to the creation of a communist society. Bourgeois ideologues provide their own distorted interpretation of the tenets of the theory of scientific communism that concretize the law-governed patterns involved in the transition to the highest phase of the communist formation. Reality itself refutes this version of the Sovietologists. Developed socialism is a society growing in a law-governed way into communism; a society in which the material-technical base of communism is being created and in which the process of establishing a unified socialist, nationwide property is taking place, on whose basis a classless socialist, social structure is gradually taking shape. Under the conditions of developed socialism socialist self-management has been established and is functioning successfully and new forms of democratism born out of the activeness of the masses are being developed. During the course of the further law-governed and comprehensive perfection of developed socialism the features of an inherently communist society will be established and socialism will grow into communism.

The "negativist" ("nihilist") direction ((L. Breynard), A. Nove and others) is based on a version of the "crisis of socialism" as a social order that has



allegedly already "used up" the resources for its further development. Interpreting in an openly anticommunist spirit the real problems and contradictions in the development of our society the Sovietologists try to convince world public opinion that socialism is allegedly an inefficient economic and social system that gives rise to totalitarianism, restricts the freedom of the individual and so forth. This obvious falsehood does not accord with the reality.

A socialist society is one that is moving confidently along the road of social progress. It is characterized by stable rates of economic development and the implementation of a broad social program aimed at further improving the life of each worker. K.U. Chernenko has stressed that "over the past decade and a half the socialist community has doubled its volume of industrial production while during the same period capitalism has increased its industrial production by little more than one-third." (PRAVDA 15 Jun 1984)

Thus, practical experience in real developed socialism decisively refutes all the falsifications and slanderous inventions of the bourgeois Sovietologists and arms the workers on the ideological front with convincing material in order to conduct current and militant counterpropaganda work and unmask in a well-argued manner the various Sovietological interpretations of the theory and practice of the developed socialist society.

Honored scientist of the RSFSR, doctor of philosophical sciences professor Ye.A. Anufriyev. The Socialist Way of Life and the Ideological Struggle.

Under the leadership of the CPSU a developed socialist society with an inherently socialist way of life has been built in our country. It was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress that at the stage of developed socialism "the restructuring of all social relationships is being completed on the collectivist foundations internally inherent in the new order. This restructuring embraces both the material and spiritual spheres and the entire tenor of our lives." ("Materials on the 26th CPSU Congress." Moscow 1981, p 57) Developing on its own basis, this kind of socialist society manifests to the full its creative possibilities and reveals the advantages of the socialist way of life.

The problem of the way of life under contemporary conditions has been brought to the forefront of the ideological struggle. The struggle between the two ways of life as one of the manifestations of the class struggle in the world arena was also going on earlier, but now it has acquired not only greater scale but also certain features that testify to the further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and the insidiousness of its ideologues.

During the Sixties, when for a number of reasons the capitalist economy was characterized by great stability, the ideologues of capitalism developed the concept of "popular capitalism" and "the state of general prosperity." Later they developed a feral propaganda campaign in defense of human rights, which were allegedly being violated in the socialist countries. During the Seventies, under the influence of further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism in their propaganda the bourgeois ideologues started to make extensive use of the problem of the way of life. On the one hand they started to advertise the "values" of the bourgeois way of life, particularly the American way of life, while on the other they started to discredit the socialist way of life, trying to undermine socialism from within.



In the United States, where previously they talked much about the existence of unlimited opportunities for the individual, they have now started to speak of the "individual's boundaries of hope" and movement up the professional ladder. The social security system has started to be regarded as an act of theft from "honest and energetic entrepreneurs." On this subject the French political expert P. (Dommerg) waxes ironic: "Why waste the taxpayers' money to provide an education or a state work place for poor people, as was done during the Sixties, if the chief thing is to create conditions that enable the honest employer to hire the unemployed?" ("The United States: the Conservative Wave." Moscow, 1984, p 257) Advertising of free enterprise has increased, along with the attacks on those who criticize it... "Beware of all those who speak ill of America": this is what the radio sounds off day after day in the United States. The major firms supply schools gratis with audiovisual equipment, books and comic books extolling the American way of life. In the colleges "departments for the teaching of the doctrine of capitalism" are set up free. (Ibid., p 258) Propaganda of the American way of life is linked to the 200th anniversary of the American constitution which will be celebrated in 1987; that same constitution in which it is asserted that no private property should be confiscated for public use. Each year up to \$2.5 billion are spent to propagandize the United States (KOMMUNIST No 4, 1982, p 99).

The emergence of so-called sociological propaganda is connected with the way of life; this tries, on the one hand, to create the illusion of prosperity in the bourgeois way of life, and on the other, tries to shake the bastions of socialism. This propaganda is void of any rational, scientifically substantiated ideas. It is not aimed at the individual's developed culture but is oriented on his material demands, which are shaped by business itself, and it proceeds from the premise that everyday life itself creates a certain attitude toward it and determines the way of life. "Sociological propaganda can be likened to ploughing and direct propaganda to sowing; the sowing cannot be done before the ploughing." (O.A. Feofanov. "Sociological Propaganda in the Developed Capitalist Countries and the Ideological Struggle." VOPROSY FILOSOFII No 1, 1974, p 70)

Sociological propaganda prepares the conditions for distorted ideas about reality. It makes use of advertising for goods, television, radio, design, education, tourism, journalism, musical rhythms and so forth. Here the opinion is firmly implanted that everything that is American is good, while everything socialist, especially Soviet, is evil. Of course, it would be incorrect to link things directly with the way of life. But if things carry a alien symbolism (the American flag, the national emblem, the brandname label and so forth), then already they are starting to play a definite social role in life. Unfortunately, some of our young people do not attach the proper significance to this, and they fall under the influence of this symbolism and judge a way of life by things. The individual's ethical downfall often starts from the point where things become his main goal. Such a person can fall into the network of hostile secret agents.

At the same time it should be noted that abroad youth is acting with increasing frequency against the advertising of symbolism, thus acting against the imperialist monopolies.

Propaganda of the values of the socialist way of life should neutralize sociological propaganda. Here, decisive importance attaches to enhanced culture,

the consciousness of Soviet people, and the struggle against petty bourgeois, consumerist attitudes. Speaking about the individual with developed capabilities, K. Marx wrote "... in order to make use of the multitude of things a person should be capable of using them, that is, he should be a person with a high degree of culture..." (K. Marx and F. Engels. Works, 2d edition, Vol 46, part I, p 386). A high level of culture means mastery of all the spiritual riches that mankind has developed. Culture enriches the spiritual content of demand and consumption. Sensible demand and sensible consumption are associated with a person's culture and consciousness and with his fundamental orientations. A varied diet based on scientifically substantiated standards, beautiful and comfortable clothing, furniture--none of these things is at variance with our Soviet way of life. However, what is alien to our way of life is any worship of things and a desire to assert oneself not through labor but by the possession of certain things.

In our society there are some people whose range of demands is limited merely to material interests. Their moral world is impoverished and narrow. This creates fertile ground for individualist attitudes. As the Lithuanian poet E. Mezhelaitis has written, "It should never be forgotten that on the diagram showing the growth of the individual, parallel to the material line there runs another--the spiritual, intellectual line. Life always takes it revenge when one of these lines is given preference while the other is forgotten." (E.V. Mezhelaitis. Collected Works, in three volumes, Moscow, 1979, Vol 3, p 417)

Features and qualities that evoke admiration from workers all over the world are inherent in the socialist way of life. And in this connection it is particularly important when comparing the two ways of life to go beyond assessments of "worse" and "better." It is important to emphasize that we are different, and to show the fundamental differences between the socialist way of life and bourgeois way of life.

Our country is resolving its tasks in an atmosphere of general employment and people's confidence in the future. They have free access to the loftiest of spiritual values. The USSR Constitution not only proclaims but also guarantees citizens the kinds of rights and freedoms that the individual does not and cannot have in the capitalist world. The typical features of the bourgeois way of life are social inequality, a low level of culture and education in a significant portion of the population, "mass" culture permeated with individualism, profit, indifference to an individual's suffering and his life, and so forth. "Thousands and thousands of people in the West," writes (A. Baling) (Australia), do not know how to write an address on an envelope or read an announcement in a magazine. And this worries no one since it is a question of a characteristic feature of the much-vaunted western way of life--indifference to the fate of the individual. I, me, mine--this is skillfully hammered into people's head from the time they are born." ("Russian Emigres on the Land of the Soviets" SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Dec 1983).

One important feature of the socialist way of life is labor activeness, which determines all other forms of life activity. Under socialism labor is not only a means of earning a living but also a basic means of self-realization for the individual and a main factor in his social prestige. The right of Soviet citizens to labor is fixed in the USSR Constitution. We note that labor

rights are completely absent from the constitutions of countries like the United States, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and so forth. For the socialist person life is unthinkable without active participation in social work and without the desire for knowledge. Our way of life is based on the revolutionary, labor and combat traditions of the Soviet people, taken up and continued by the rising generation.

Bourgeois ideologues often cite figures characterizing the average per capita income. However, the methods used for these calculations are quite primitive since they do not cover differences in the incomes of different population groups. As a counterweight to these calculations we show the real income of the Soviet individual, the affordable prices of goods and services, the stable low rent rates for housing, the use of public consumption funds in the interests of the workers, and so forth.

Strengthening the material and spiritual bases of the socialist way of life and the shaping of the new man is one of the main tasks of CPSU social policy. It states in the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum decree that "it is essential to propagandize skillfully and creatively the Soviet way of life and the fundamental values of socialism. It is essential to support everything progressive in social practice, and to assert and clearly reveal the new quality of life for the working masses, including collectivism and comradeship, moral health and social optimism, and each person's confidence in tomorrow and his high culture in labor and consumption and behavior and everyday life... The strengthening of socialist consciousness is taking place in a persistent struggle against relapses into the petty bourgeois mentality and the ideological influence of imperialist propaganda penetrating through various channels to the consciousness of part of the population" (Materials on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 14-15 June 1983, p 73).

Doctor of philosophical sciences professor V.F. Khalipov. Unmasking the Anti-communist Distortions of the Foreign Policy of the Countries of the Socialist Community.

Questions of preserving world civilization and the prospects for its development, the struggle for peace and against the threat of nuclear war and for disarmament and the relaxation of international tension are now at the center of mankind's attention. Our party and the fraternal communist and workers' parties provide a characterization of the acute problems of the age from scientific, class, Marxist-Leninist positions, and persistently unmask the slanderous falsifications of our ideological adversaries.

The foreign policy of the CPSU and Soviet state has always been in the center of the ideological struggle, and it still is. In the West literally mountains of books and articles have been written and thousands of speeches made and hundreds of cinema and television films produced in which lies and slander are leveled at our party and country, at the fraternal parties and states, and at their peaceful foreign policy.

The range of fabrications here is truly immense. But in all cases the main aims and principles of socialism's foreign policy are literally turned upside



down. Our love of peace and concern to safeguard socialism are presented as aggressiveness and a hidden threat; democratism is presented as the pursuit of self-interested goals, real humanism as attempts to confuse and as hostility toward the interests of other states, the desire to develop cooperation as seaching for advantages, principledness as obstinacy, realism as onesidedness of approach, and so on and so forth.

The falsifications of the enemies of socialism deny life itself and the entire practice of the peace-loving policy of the CPSU and of our allies and friends. But it impossible not to see the activeness and maliciousness of these falsifications, which were particularly reinforced when the present U.S. administration led by R. Reagan came to power.

R. Reagan has started to talk about and act on the fundamental problems of world politics in a manner that is far removed from parliamentary traditions and the diplomatic approach. He has proclaimed a "crusade" against communism. In his political speeches the following cannibalistic statements have been made: "The West will outlive communism... We shall write about communism as a sad and sick chapter in the history of mankind and the final pages of this history will be written in our time" (cited in KOMMUNIST No 4, 1983, p 88). R. Reagan has gone so far as to say that "the Soviet Union bears the responsibility for all the disorders taking place in the world." (Ibid., p 95) In like tone the highly place figure in the administration, L. Eagleburger, has called our country "the enemy of mankind." (Ibid.)

These irresponsible statements cannot but result in deep concern because of their cynicism, anticommunism, and the threat created to the cause of peace and the security of the peoples. This is why today it is essential to redouble the efforts made to unmask the ideological sabotage and aggressive militarist course of the United States and its accomplices.

At all stages in the contemporary epoch the nucleus of anticommunism has been and remains anti-Sovietism. The enemies of communism wage their struggle primarily against the CPSU and the Soviet state. Our enemies are particularly discomfited by the fact that the other socialist countries learn from the experience of the USSR and that all progressive mankind takes pride in its achievements. The land of the soviets is equated with the leading forces in the struggle against imperialism. The basic concern of the anticommunists is to undermine the authroity of the USSR. But they will not succeed in this, just as they have not succeeded in the past.

The present propaganda actions of the Reagan administration and the psychological warfare that it has unleashed can with complete justification be characterized by the words of V.I. Lenin: "a campaign of lies and slander on the soil of an outrageous political hatred," "a rabid, wild howling in which sometimes there is not only no reason but even simply no articulate sound to be heard." (V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works, Vol 32, pp 426, 424)

The basic principles of our ideological struggle against our class enemies have been and remain its offensive nature, the class approach, activeness and uncompromisingness in unmasking ideas and concepts hostile to socialism, active



propaganda and affirmation of communist ideas and so forth. In its ideological activity our party and the Soviet state make extensive use of the mass information media and the entire system of communist indoctrination for the workers.

Characterizing the tasks in the struggle against bourgeois ideology and its accomplices, the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum emphasized that "propaganda is designed to convincingly reveal the antipeople essence of imperialism and its policy and ideology and the inability of bourgeois society to eliminate the social ills and national and racial injustice. We must develop the political vigilance of Soviet people and their implacability toward hostile views and the ability to withstand ideological sabotage by the class enemy and opportunist and revisionist attacks against real socialism. One active rebuff to anti-Sovietism and anticommunism is the constant direction in the activity of party committees and the mass information media. What is needed is a well thought-out, unified and effective counterpropaganda system." (Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 14-15 June 1983, p 74)

The core of the ideological struggle is the unmasking of anticommunism--the main ideological-political weapon of imperialism which permeates its domestic and foreign policies. First, anticommunism is the ideology of the reactionary classes and social forces, and its main content is an apologetic for capitalism and slander against the socialist order and falsification of the policies and goals of communist parties and the teaching of Marxism-Leninism. Second, anti-communism is a policy pursued by the bourgeoisie, primarily by its most reactionary circles. Third, anticommunism is the aggregate of ways and methods for the struggle against communism, constantly building up its arsenal of means for influencing people's consciousness in a spirit of hostility toward communism.

Anticommunism is a mixture of various reactionary, counterrevolutionary, ideological and sociological elements in bourgeois philosophy, history, sociology and economic theories. It is a variegated collection of concepts and ideas that mask the defects of capitalism and praise it and at the same time strive to discredit socialism and its successes.

We can cut short the anticommunist sallies of our enemies with the aid of the system of counterpropaganda work to whose improvement the CPSU gives its unremitting attention.

Counterpropaganda is that specific field of ideological-political activity by the CPSU and the organs and organizations that its leads that insures the defense of the ideals and values of real socialism, social progress in general, the class tempering of the workers, and uncompromising struggle against bourgeois ideology. It is organized, purposeful, offensive and systematic activity in the sphere of ideology and social psychology that has as its aim the unmasking of false, subversive imperialist propaganda.

The strategic tasks of counterpropaganda activity by all elements of socialism's political system are as follows: to close the channels through which hostile ideology is disseminated; to develop in the citizens of the socialist countries an ideological and moral and psychological immunity against it; to shape in people firm communist convictions, patriotism and socialist internationalism

on the basis of a profound recognition of Marxist-Leninist theory; and to struggle against all kinds and forms of ideological sabotage by imperialism by means of unmasking its aims and the methods by which these aims are pursued, and also to deliver preventive strikes against the ideological enemy.

In terms of its content and forms counterpropaganda is an organic part of citizens' ideological-political, labor and moral indoctrination. One important task for counterpropaganda activity in the international arena is to make known in an accessible and convincing form the truth about socialist society and its fundamental advantages and its policy of peace to the broadest popular masses throughout the world, show the peoples the real nature of the threat of nuclear war and unmask the true bearers of this threat, and promote to the maximum the ideological-political enlightenment of the working masses and their cohesion in the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress.

In carrying out counterpropaganda activity special significance attaches to explaining to the workers the policy of the CPSU and the fraternal parties, in particular the aims and tasks of their foreign policy.

What are the features that characterize foreign policy under socialism? First and foremost it is a socialist, class, internationalist policy. It is socialist because it puts into practice the interests of the new social order and it is pursued by socialist states. It is a class policy because it is founded on Marxist-Leninist theory and it is pursued by countries in which a leading role is played by the working class and its party. It is a policy that meets the real interests of all workers and expresses their implacability toward imperialism. It is therefore also an internationalist policy. The foreign policy of socialism is also characterized by other important features. It is an honest, just, principled, highly humane, ethical, farsighted, realistic and carefully weighed policy. In pursuing their foreign policy activity the countries of socialism, primarily the CEMA members, decisively repudiate the "course toward undermining the peaceful bases of interstate relations and speak out against all forms of exploitation, any attempts to interfere in the domestic affairs of other states, and the use of economic ties as a weapon used to exert political pressure, regarding this as the grossest violation of the generally recognized standards of international law..." ("Declaration of the CEMA Member Countries 'To Safeguard Peace and International Economic Cooperation'" PRAVDA 16 Jun 1984)

The growing role of the Soviet Union in international relations, its active participation in international life, and the close link between the Soviet state's domestic and foreign policy activities have been reflected in a special chapter of the USSR Constitution. This chapter fixes, in accordance with international law, the generally recognized principles of the Final Act of the Helsinki All-European Conference on Security (1975). Article 30 of the USSR Constitution fixes the principles of the relations that have been established and are maintained between the countries of the socialist community. These principles include socialist internationalism, fraternal friendship and comradely mutual aid.

At various international forums, including the United Nations, and at the conference to strengthen trust and security and for disarmament in Europe, the Soviet Union consistently takes the initiative for concrete actions aimed at radically improving the political climate on our planet.

One exceptionally important and timely initiative is our country's proposal that relations between the nuclear powers be subordinate to specified standards. It was put forward in a speech made by K.U. Chernenko to electors on 2 March 1984 (see K.U. Chernenko. "The People and the Party Are One." Moscow, 1984, pp 28-29). The USSR announced its readiness at any time to enter into an agreement with the other nuclear powers to jointly recognize such standards and to make them binding.

These and other peace proposals and initiatives by our country, meeting the vital interests of all mankind, are evoking a broad international response that proves that the Soviet Union's foreign policy enjoys great authority.

At the same time the CPSU and the Soviet state proceed from the realities of the complex international situation. K.U. Chernenko emphasizes that "when it is a question of the security of the peoples, foreign policy and diplomacy can do much. But not everything. In the world arena we have to deal with the kinds of political forces for whom goodwill is alien and who are deaf to the arguments of reason. And here the restraining might of our defensive potential plays an irreplaceable role. It is now not only a guarantee for the creative labor of the Soviet people but also a guarantee for general peace in the world." (PRAVDA 29 May 1984)

Honored scientist of the RSFSR, doctor of philosophical sciences professor M.P. Skirido. The Spiritual Crisis of Capitalism and Certain Tasks of Counter-propaganda.

For a number of reasons the ideological struggle between the two opposing systems has been exacerbated to the extreme. It has taken the form of a global clash to win the souls, minds and hearts of the people. The ideological struggle itself has now started to play a special role in the international arena. It permeates political, economic, diplomatic and cultural relations between countries and peoples. The struggle of ideas is being waged on all the continents of our planet with the use of radio, television and the other means available to the mass information media.

The ideological struggle is now taking place under conditions of further exacerbation of the contradictions between the two world systems. Here it should be stated that the imperialists are trying to spread their own ideas in the countries of socialism, are interfering in their domestic affairs, trying to worsen relations between peoples, and counting on nationalism. The ideological struggle is penetrating all fields in the competition between the two opposing sociopolitical systems. As it wins over one position after another, socialism demonstrates its indisputable advantages in all spheres of social life, while capitalist society is characterized by a deepening not only of its economic and political crisis but also its spiritual crisis.

When counterposing the two sociopolitical systems one against the other and criticizing capitalism and revealing its defects and contradictions, it is necessary to characterize the spiritual crisis of contemporary bourgeois society. It is pointed out in the documents of the CPSU that this crisis "is striking the institutions of power and the bourgeois political parties, and shaking



the most elementary moral standards. ...The decline in spiritual culture continues, crime grows." (Materials of the 26th CPSU Congress, Moscow, 1977, p 29). The spiritual crisis of capitalism is being reflected in many concrete phenomena.

First, neither the heads of bourgeois states and governments nor the spiritual leaders of capitalism are now able to offer their peoples the kinds of ideas that would unite and inspire them and open up for them prospects for social progress and to achieve prosperity and true happiness. Some bourgeois leaders have been forced to acknowledge that the countries of the West need new ideas and spiritual values that could oppose Marxism-Leninism and the ideals of communism. But there are no such ideas in the arsenal of capitalism and therefore the soberly thinking ideologues of capitalism are expressing open alarm about the spiritual crisis of capitalism.

Second, present-day bourgeois ideology and philosophy are unable to provide correct answers to the questions being raised by life itself and by the course of social development; as for example: what are the historical prospects for mankind's development?; how can peace be maintained on earth?; how can the earth's food supply be maintained?; how can the natural environment be protected?; why are there millions of unemployed, unfortunate and ruined people in the countries of the West?; and so forth. Only Marxism-Leninism provides an answer to these questions, while the numerous doctrines, concepts and theories invented by the bourgeois ideologues do not withstand the test of time and are refuted by life itself.

Third, present-day bourgeois ideology and sociology are characterized by a loss of faith in human progress, pessimism and fear for the future. The great changes that have taken place in social development in the world arena and in individual countries cannot be appreciated within the confines of the bourgeois world outlook. This is causing alarm in the consciousness of the bourgeois ideologues and is interpreted by them as the "collapse of civilization" and "chaos in social development." Trying to distract the attention of their own peoples from today's problems in bourgeois society, some bourgeois ideologues, philosophers, sociologists and writers are intimidating them with the energy and ecological crises, the danger of overpopulation on the planet, the adverse social consequences of the modern scientific and technical revolution, the inevitability of world nuclear war and so forth. And if to this we add facts such as the tens of millions of unemployed, price increases, crime, racial discrimination and the violation of human rights and freedoms in the world of capital it becomes clear why all this is evoking despair, pessimism and a loss of faith in the future in many of the citizens of countries in the West.

Fourth, the spiritual crisis of capitalism is seen in the crisis of bourgeois morals, the violation of the elementary standards of behavior, the growth in crime, sexual perversions, the mass disintegration of the family, the presence of an enormous number of alcoholics and drug addicts, and so forth. The mass information media are shaping in the people of the western countries a social, political and spiritual passivity, primitivism, a scornful attitude toward real culture, history and the achievements of human civilization. Progressively thinking philosophers and sociologists recognize that American society is incapable of shaping people distinguished by sensitivity and concern for others; such a society ineluctably breeds smart dealers, while people of business are honored.



Fifth, one graphic manifestation of the spiritual crisis of bourgeois society is the fact that many of its sociologists and philosophers and psychologists and military theoreticians are trying to justify the idea of man's essential aggressiveness. The roots of such opinions lie in the philosophy of Nietzsche, the ideological forerunner of German fascism. The bourgeois ideologues want to convince the masses that war, the militarization of social life, the arms race and the unleashing of military conflicts are useful. Deceiving the peoples, they assert that war accelerates social progress. The American bourgeois sociologist L. (Shasen) asserts that it is not peace but war that is an eternal attribute of mankind since it pursues man everywhere. An adherent of these ideas, (Freyda Daym), in the book "Total Destruction" writes that man carries within himself the seeds of his own destruction, seen in his aggression against himself and the environment. (Daym) thinks that man is naturally endowed with the "Satanic effect," seen in the form of weapons.

While giving a party evaluation to such ideas it is necessary to emphasize that they reflect the aspirations of those who are preparing mankind for nuclear war. In this connection one task for our propaganda is to show in specific and convincing examples the aggressive nature of modern imperialism, first and foremost U.S. imperialism, which since World War II has unleashed 215 military conflicts and 19 times threatened the use of nuclear weapons.

And finally, the spiritual crisis of present-day capitalism has found concentrated expression in anticommunism. It states in the CPSU Program: "Anticommunism is a reflection of the extreme degree of degradation in bourgeois ideology." (Moscow, 1976, p 52) Present-day anticommunism has become one of the functions of the imperialist states. The struggle against socialism is now being waged by war departments, specially created centers, radio, television and the press in these states. Present-day anticommunism is closely linked with reactionary state organs in the United States such as the CIA. It is there that plans are drawn up for the ideological and political sabotage against the socialist and developing countries.

One imprescriptible feature of present-day anticommunism is anti-Sovietism--the struggle against the Soviet social order, way of life, culture, morals, and domestic and foreign policy. U.S. imperialism is waging "psychological warfare" against the USSR and the countries of the socialist community, using methods such as disinformation, the spreading of slander, intimidation, espionage, the use of religion and nationalism, and so forth. All this determines our tasks in the field of criticism of the capitalist reality, unmasking imperialism's ideological sabotage, and organizing and carrying out counterpropaganda.

First and foremost it is essential to unmask the aims and methods of bourgeois propaganda and to show in specific examples its false, anti-Soviet nature; and to have the skill to expose the fabrications of the enemy and foresee his possible intentions. And in this connection it is necessary to forestall attempts by imperialist propaganda to influence our people, especially our youth. And for this it is necessary to determine in good time what information and what ideas the enemy is trying to spread among Soviet people and what goals he is pursuing in so doing.

When conducting counterpropaganda work in the VUZ's it is essential to show, using specific examples and convincing facts in training lectures, scientific studies and propaganda statements, the negative aspects of capitalism and the bourgeois way of life, and at the same time to propagandize skillfully and graphically the successes of socialism and the advantages of our way of life and of socialist democracy.

Doctor of philosophical sciences professor Yu.V. Yeremin. Youth and Bourgeois Propaganda.

The content of bourgeois propaganda aimed at the rising generation reflects the positions of the bourgeois science on youth--"yunologiya" ["the study of youth"]. In the works of the sociologists of Yale and other schools, youth is regarded as the most dynamic element of the social system, transforming it and making it more complex through the introduction of new relations and links. For example, (S. Lipset) and (S. Hook) suggest that in general the youth movement is responsible for the growing complexity of ideological views. The important role of the rising generation in the transformation of the world is stated in the "Club of Rome" project designated "Forum Humanum."

This kind of approach is typical of those bourgeois sociologists and theoreticians on the mass information media who try to work out the principles of propaganda oriented on the Soviet youth audience. In the opinion of the American psychologist S. Jacobi it is precisely youth with its oversensitive attitude toward its own social status, contradictory range of spiritual values, interest in new problems and impatience with ideological stereotypes and information cliches, that is the most complex subject of ideological influence. And, he continues, if we bear in mind that youth in Soviet society is a tool for overcoming the allegedly traditional stagnation, then dealings with this youth should be both intellectual and differentiated.

Virtually the same line is proposed by the superficial intellectualization of bourgeois propaganda and its desire to interpret all processes and phenomena in the youth sphere via the social medium and by addressing global problems of the age such as war and peace, the scientific and technical revolution, environmental protection, the reproduction of energy and raw materials, space exploration and so forth. In this connection it is possible to single out a number of directions in the bourgeois study of youth and propaganda aimed at youth, namely the intellectualist, the stratified, and the global directions.

The intellectualist direction is characterized by an updated "kul'turtregerstvo" [from the German "Kulturtraeger"--ed]. In bourgeois social science (D. Bell, (M. Breyk), K. Keniston, (I. Kristol), (D. Sirl), (R. Wheeler), (D. Habdige), youth is regarded as the bearer of the new cultural source that transforms society. In recent years "yunologiya" itself has evolved from some concept popularized in magazines into a pseudoscience. Propaganda has accordingly been oriented on the educated young person, whose cultural level has begun to be regarded as some kind of mandatory general level of development.

The stratified direction establishes a differentiation in "yunologiya" and propaganda by social strata and sections of youth. This direction is typified

by the isolation of youth groups according to irrelevant and subjective features (origin, geographic medium, level of income, racial and national features, the so-called coefficient of intellectuality and so forth). It is oriented primarily on "middle" class youth. This diffuse category includes the intelligentsia (scientific and technical and creative youth), the student body, students in senior grades, and some young workers and peasants, that is, young people who have a certain level of education and culture. The scientific and technical youth is counted on primarily for information about the development of science and technology in the West, the creative youth for free creativity, the student body for the social status of young people, young workers and peasants for the organization of production and standard of living, and so forth.

The global direction reflects the appeal by "yunologiya" and propaganda to youth on world problems. Here, convergence sources can be clearly traced, whether it be questions of disarmament, new industrial technology, space research or ocean studies, or the ecological balance. The young person is regarded as the subject in the creation of a new world order in which class, ideological and political differences will be eliminated. However, in fact all these problems are interpreted in a definite ideological and political aspect and always from the class positions of the bourgeoisie.

The growing complexity of the content of information aimed at youth has affected all channels by which it is disseminated. Voice of America, for example, has recently been carrying programs from the fields of science, technology and art aimed at young "intellectuals." The journal AMERICA has started to carry fewer publicity photographs and devote more space to longer articles in more serious vein. Among the movies suggested for screening in Soviet cinemas the number of adventure and cowboy movies has been reduced and the stress is being laid more often on complex associations and symbols, unexpected twists in the productions, better camera work, and a new approach to the solution of mankind's age-old problems; but all this is subordinated to the class interests of the bourgeoisie.

With the BBC and the journal ANGLIYA there has been a marked desire to surprise readers with the extensive choice of subjects calculated to satisfy the most varied tastes and interests. Here we have material on the automation of engineering work, the history of literature, the situation with university and school education, the conditions for being hired for work, pay for young workers, improving production skills, use of the latest technology in agriculture and so forth.

In the FRG the mass information media are trying to subordinate the youth movement to the interests of the monopolies in the matter of environmental protection.

The above-mentioned features used by bourgeois propaganda to influence youth must be taken into account when organizing counterpropaganda measures among Soviet youth. Today our propaganda among youth should take at least two factors into account: first, the object of ideological influence possesses quite deep and varied information; second, new information based on scientific data as it were systematizes and enriches previous information. It is typical that publications in the series EVRIKA ["Eureka"], the journals KVANT ["Quantum"], YUNIY TEKHNIK ["Young Technician"] YUNIY NATURALIST ["The Young Naturalist"] and so forth, which provide basic scientific knowledge, enjoy great popularity



among the youth. In the youth sociopolitical publications, material on criticism of bourgeois ideology has begun to be of a predominantly analytical nature. The youth television program Chto? Gde? Kogda? [What? Where? When?] has gradually been transformed into a series of intellectual competitions.

In practical Komsomol work consideration is given to the various youth categories, in particular the scientific category. Conferences, seminars, youth training schools, the creation of a postgraduate student body in the Komsomol Central Committee Higher Komsomol School and so forth all help in increasing the number and deepening the content of studies on the problems of the present-day ideological struggle as it applies to youth.

The Komsomol and other public organizations and the mass communications organs take into account class, professional and amateur interests and the psychological features of youth. Hence also the different approach to the planning and organization of the information passed on. It is also seen in the system of Komsomol political enlightenment. Here the "School for Young Leninists," the "School for Basic Marxist-Leninist Knowledge" and the "School for Sociopolitical Knowledge" are functioning, along with theoretical seminars. In these schools young people study the biography of V.I. Lenin, the history of the CPSU and Komsomol, the basics of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy and scientific communism. Special attention is paid to questions such as the socialist way of life and youth, the historical experience of the CPSU in the struggle to build socialism and communism, and current problems in the international youth movement. According to their professional, scientific and other interests, young people with a sufficiently high level of education study questions of improving the economic mechanism, CPSU agrarian policy, and the development of culture and art in the USSR.

The increasingly complex flow of information has been differentiated by categories and interests in the youth press (in particular with the creation in recent years of the journals STUDENCHESKIY MERIDIAN ["Student Meridian"] and YUNIY KHUDOZHNIK ["The Young Artist"]) and in lecture propaganda that forms in the rising generation an immunity against accepting bourgeois ideology.

By participating in the peace movement and the movement to prevent nuclear war, Soviet youth moves actively against bourgeois ideology in the world arena. At the same time international festivals, forums, meetings and seminars for the youth and students of different states taking place within the framework of the struggle for peace help to confirm in the consciousness of young people the ideals of democracy and social progress.

The objective nature of the now complex ideological struggle is still not always recognized by the subjects of ideological influence. This is shown convincingly by, in particular, a study of the youth press. On the theme of counterpropaganda the presentation of information and the reportage style often dominate, to the detriment of analysis. Ideological-political and international ranges of problems in publications aimed at different youth categories are sometimes universal in nature. Serious questions are sometimes replaced with extreme oversimplification.



It is expedient to organize special training and retraining for propaganda workers and mass information media workers in connection with the increasingly complex nature of the ideological struggle, and to recruit to the leadership of schools and seminars within the system of Komsomol political enlightenment well-known production specialists, while well-known and authoritative scientists, writers and figures in art could be recruited to speak to youth audiences and in the press and on radio and television. More attention should obviously be given to discussion clubs, especially in the student medium; this would help young people to acquire consciously and independently their sociopolitical views.

A more thorough consideration of the specific features of any given youth category in the appropriate youth publications when dealing with counterpropaganda subjects, the introduction of a specific ideological-political direction in the numerous professional measures (youth competitions and gatherings according to occupation, competitions in skills and so forth), and the development of specialized tourism according to the propaganda provided will all promote more effective counter-propaganda work among youth.

As it states in the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Further Improving Party Leadership of the Komsomol and Enhancing its Role in the Communist Indoctrination of Youth," it is essential that "the numerous forms of mass propaganda and agitation, political enlightenment and counterpropaganda work be subordinated to forming in the rising generation a deep Marxist-Leninist understanding of the law-governed patterns in present-day social development, along with Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism." (PRAVDA 7 Jul 1984)

Candidate of philosophical sciences docent M.Kh. Ganiyeva. The Falsification by Bourgeois Ideologues of Experience Gained in Resolving the National Question in the Republics of the Soviet East.

The intensification of the ideological struggle in the international arena is connected with the features of the historical period through which mankind is now living. This period is marked by an unprecedented intensity in the antagonism between the two opposing social systems, the further increased strength of socialism, and the deepening and exacerbation of the contradictions in the capitalist world. As was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, under these conditions "there has been an increase in the activity of the class enemy's propaganda means, and his attempts to exert a corrupting influence on the Soviet people's consciousness have intensified." (Materials on the 26th CPSU Congress, p 75).

One of the targets of the ideological attacks is national relations within the USSR. The bourgeois ideologues are trying with all their might to discredit Leninist nationalities policy and belittle its successes, especially in the Central Asian republics. And this is not happenstance. Following the collapse of imperialism's worldwide colonial system, the liberated countries--the new states in Asia, Africa and Latin America--faced the question of which path to follow. Through their own experience they were aware of the essence of imperialist colonial policy and capitalist exploitation. It is not therefore surprising that the number of countries choosing the path of a socialist orientation

has grown. One important factor affecting this choice is the Soviet's state's experience in successfully resolving the national questions and the earlier achievement of a high level of socioeconomic development by the other peoples of the USSR.

The experience of the republics of the Soviet East, which after the Great October Socialist Revolution set out to build socialism, bypassing the stage of capitalism, is particularly attractive for the peoples of the liberated countries. In a short time historically our republics achieved a very great upsurge and bourgeoning. This became possible thanks to the implementation of Leninist nationalities policy and the party program on the national question, with selfless aid from the Russian people. The bourgeois ideologues are trying to discredit the Soviet experience gained in solving the national question. To this end they resort to various tricks, coarse falsification of the Soviet reality, and ideological sabotage, and they try to undermine the unbreakable unity and fraternal friendship of the peoples of the USSR.

Moreover, whereas previously the bourgeois falsifiers denied the achievements of the republics in the Soviet East, calling them backward, now they have been forced to acknowledge these achievements. The historical achievements of the peoples of Central Asia fill them with fear. The bourgeois ideologues fear that "many leaders in the developing countries regard the Soviet model as something they can use for their own needs." ("The Soviet System of Government." Chicago, London, 1980, p IX). Progress in the Central Asian republics is explained by them as a natural process in the "modernization" of all human society. "Modernization," they announce, "is also spreading to the Soviet Union, and hence also to the subject and Central Asian peoples within the USSR." (N. Lubin. "Assimilation and Retention of Ethnic Identity in Uzbekistan." ASIAN AFFAIRS Vol 12, p. III, 1981, p 277)

At the same time the bourgeois falsifiers are trying to represent CPSU national policy in the republics of the Soviet East as a policy of "Russification." In order to substantiate these lies they distort the true facts and write, for example, that in the USSR nations, national languages and national culture are allegedly disappearing, and that the Russian language and Russian culture are becoming dominant through supplanting national languages and cultures. The apologists of colonialism falsify the law-governed process of population shift in the USSR, which is taking place as the result of the construction of gigantic national economic complexes, and the associated inflow of Russian and other nationalities into the republics of the Soviet East is depicted as "Russification." Here they deliberately remain silent about the enormous role that the Russians and the other peoples of the USSR have played in the socio-economic and culture progress of the Central Asian republics.

There is also another direction in the falsifications of national relations in the USSR, based on a false interpretation of the process of population growth in the Soviet East. The Sovietologists assert that the demographic imbalance that has allegedly taken shape between Russians and the indigenous peoples of the Soviet East serves as the main cause for the "psychological awkwardness" in relations between them ("Soviet Moslems" from a special correspondent. THE ECONOMIST, Vol 280 N 7200, 1981, p 54).

Because of the intensification of the ideological struggle in the world arena, in the capitalist countries there has been a considerable expansion of the network of institutions engaged in studying individual regions of the Soviet Union, in particular Central Asia, questions of economics and the problems of the Soviet state's domestic policy with regard to the Central Asian republics. Thus, at some of the colleges in the United States centers for the study of Central Asia have been set up and are functioning. At Columbia University there is a Central Asia Institute that offers lecture courses on "The Soviet Nationalities and Education and Culture in the USSR" and "Soviet Nationalities Policy," and permanent seminars are run on "Central Asian Studies" and "The Soviet National Problem." At the same university a center offering "A Program of Studies on Soviet National Problems" has been set up, in which the Uzbek language is being actively studied. The main task of this and similar centers is to distort our reality and the nationalities policy of the CPSU and Soviet state.

British Sovietologists are working in a similar direction.

Under the conditions of the deepening ideological antagonism between the two social systems, the task for Soviet social scientists is to unmask in a well-argued manner the unsoundness of the concepts of bourgeois ideologues who falsify CPSU nationalities policy, convincingly show the advantages of socialist national policy over the misanthropic policy of imperialism in the field of national relations, and reveal the historical successes of all nations and nationalities in our country and their friendship and indissoluble unity, and also the definite complexities in solving questions of inter-nation relations. "In a country like ours," K.U. Chernenko said at the CPSU Central Committee April (1984) Plenum, "we naturally cannot remove from the agenda the tasks of improving relations between nations. The soviets, which have played an outstanding role in eliminating national strife and fostering fraternal friendship between the peoples, should seriously look into the content of the nationalities question also in the form in which it exists under the conditions of developed socialism." (Materials on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 10 April 1984, Moscow, 1984, p 14)

As we direct the fire of our criticism at the bourgeois falsifiers, at the same time we must propagandize the views and ideas of progressive figures in the capitalist figures, especially those who speak out actively against the forces of reaction and militarism and for peace and social progress.

Doctor of philosophical sciences professor T.R. Kondratkov. Persistently To Unmask the Aggressive Essence of Present-day Militarism.

The tasks in intensifying the offensive struggle against imperialist ideology--the ideology of aggression and war--set by the 26th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum, demand from the social scientists the decisive unmasking of the aggressive essence of present-day militarism and the disclosure of its baneful consequences for all mankind.

Present-day militarism, which has reached unprecedented scales, affects like a cancerous tumor all aspects of life in bourgeois society. Its roots are to be found in the private-ownership, exploiter essence of the capitalist system,



the further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and the aggressive policy and belligerent ideology of state-monopoly capital.

The reactionary essence of militarism is profoundly revealed in the works of V.I. Lenin--the "vital manifestation" of imperialism and its aggressive nature. Here V.I. Lenin noted "the particularly tragic page in the bloody history of bloody imperialism " opened up by American militarists. For each dollar, V.I. Lenin wrote, there are clods of mud and blood stains (V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works Vol 37, pp 48, 50). It is from these characterizations that we should proceed when characterizing present-day militarism.

Present-day militarism, whose center has become the United States, differs substantially from militarism during the years of World War I and World War II. It has assumed a sinister appearance, and it depends on a more powerful industrial base and nuclear missile and space technology that embodies the latest achievements of science and technology. All this is increasing its aggressiveness and adventurism and creating a threat to the very existence of civilization on earth.

There has been a sharp increase in the aggressiveness of U.S. militarists, which since World War II have become rich through the production of weapons and have become powerful and ruthless exploiters of other countries and peoples. It states in the new program of the Communist Party of the United States that "American capitalism emerged from World War II as the most powerful imperialist power in the financial, economic and military sense. For some time it had the monopoly on the atom bomb. The monopoly rulers of the United States have striven to have dominion over the entire world and to exploit it. Their aim has been to establish the 'age of America.' The U.S. monopolies have become the largest 'traders in death' in history. American banks have been transformed into the financial sharks of world capitalism. Enormous resources have been used to used up to insure superprofits for the monopolies, 'roll back socialism,' and suppress national liberation movements." (SShA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA No 1, 1983, p 119).

One very grave crime committed by the American militarists against the peoples of the world was the development and use of weapons of mass destruction at the end of World War II. The two atomic bombs dropped by order of the U.S. President H. Truman on the peaceful Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki killed more than 300,000 people. By perpetrating this act of vandalism the American miliarists were pursuing primarily political ends, namely to demonstrate the power of the new eapon to the Soviet Union in order to apply pressure on it in solving postwar problems. However, they did not succeed in intimidating our people through nuclear blackmail or of depriving them of the fruits of the victory over German fascism and Japanese militarism, won at the cost of enormous effort and sacrifice.

Militarist circles in the United States were the initiators of the arms race in nuclear missile and conventional weapons, and they still are. The arms race has grown to especially dangerous scales under the present U.S. administration, which has set its course toward the accelerated development of a qualitatively new offensive strategic nuclear potential, in addition to the one it already possesses. Within the United States the large-scale production of new mass



destruction weapons systems is being expanded--neutron, chemical, biological and laser weapons. The nuclear first-strike capability is being built up by deploying U.S. missiles in Europe, targeted against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Along with this the United States is implementing a program for the militarization of outer space. It is a question of preparations for the "star wars" proclaimed by R. Reagan and the development and deployment of various space weapons systems capable of knocking out enemy ICBM's and satellites. A Space Command has been created within the U.S. Air Force. The special danger of these measures is obvious. As was underscored in the Soviet government statement, "moving the arms race into space would sharply increase the risk of military catastrophe and undermine the prospects for limiting and cutting back arms in general." (PRAVDA 30 Jun 1984).

Militarism has deformed the economies of the United States and its allies, transforming them into conveyor belts for military production, and into the "business of nuclear death." This is associated with inflated military budgets, cutbacks in the civilian sectors of the economy, an absolutely enormous increase in the army of unemployed, price increases, taxes and further encroachments on workers' rights. At the same time a militarization of politics is taking place, together with hyperbolization of military force as a decisive means of solving all political problems. This is particularly typical of the present U.S. administration. For R. Reagan politics is "real war" against the socialist countries and "direct hostility" between the United States and the USSR; diplomacy is the "diplomacy of force"; ideology is a "crusade" against communism. The danger of such views is that they have been raised to the status of state policy and have become the views that guide the activity of the aggressive, militarist circles, who have set their course toward preparation for nuclear war.

American militarism is trying to subject the militarist forces of the other imperialist countries to its own aggressive interests. The aggressiveness of West German militarism, restored and fed by the U.S. monopolists, is increasing. Militarist circles in the United States are trying to transform the FRG into the main bulwark of reaction in Europe, into a launchpad for American missiles. For their part the West German militarists find in this alliance a guarantee for their own aggressive plans in Europe, and a support for pursuing their own political course, aimed primarily against the socialist countries. Following the assumption of power in the FRG by the CDU-CSU-FDP government coalition, militarism and revanchism have been intensified.

The military, political and economic alliance between U.S. and Japanese militarists is a source of danger in Asia. Since World War II the United States has made Japan its ally, a solid industrial base for the military-political blocs in the Far East, and a most important element of its own Asian policy and strategy. The Japanese militarists also derive advantage from alliance with the United States. With its help they count on restoring Japan's military might and reshaping its armed forces, and supplying them with all kinds of up-to-date military hardware and weapons in order to pursue their own predatory aims in Asia. "The remilitarization of Japan," Kim Il-song has noted, "is a threat not only to the peoples of Asia. It also exerts an effect on the cause of peace throughout the world." (PRAVDA 10 Apr 1984)

In the military-political plans being drawn up by the Reagan administration an important place is given to further strengthening the alliance between American and Japanese militarism and to expanding the U.S. military presence in the Far East. The United States is trying to saddle Japan with the burden of insuring "security" in Asia and transform relations between the two countries into an "active military partnership" in which Japan should build up its own military potential, increase the might of its own armed forces and become an "unsinkable aircraft carrier" for the United States.

Thus, for the militarists the Asian continent is yet another front in the struggle against the socialist states. The United States has built up a chain of military bases and strong points there and deployed nuclear weapons. Their revitalization and strengthening of Japanese militarism is destabilizing the situation in Asia. K.U. Chernenko has stressed that "Japanese militarism has already more than once displayed its expansionist and colonialist quiddity and has more than once unleashed war. Meanwhile, revanchist cries are again heard from Tokyo and territorial claims are made. Attempts to repeat history, and moreover on a much more dangerous basis in this nuclear age, cannot fail to put many of the Asian states on their guard. Neither do such claims promise anything beneficial for Japan." (PRAVDA 24 May 1984)

The leading role in safeguarding peace in the Far East is being played by the Soviet Union--a great socialist power that, in the words of V.I. Lenin, "geographically, economically and historically belongs not only to Europe but also to Asia." (V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works, Vol 30, p 326) From the moment of the birth of the Soviet state one most important task of its policy was proclaimed to be the restructuring of international relations on the Asian and other continents on the basis of a stable peace and the independence and equality of peoples. The struggle for peace and security for the peoples of Asia and rebuffing aggression and militarism is one of the most important directions in the foreign policy activity of our party and state.

Like an octopus, U.S. militarism is also trying to entangle other continents and regions with its tentacles: Latin America, Africa, the Near East. This is confirmed by the criminal U.S. aggression against the people of Grenada, the undeclared war against Nicaragua, provocations against socialist Cuba, its participation along with Israel in the armed intervention in Lebanon, its aggressive actions in the Persian Gulf region, its support for the racists in the Republic of South Africa, and its threats against many states.

Consequently, state-monopoly capitalism develops militarism and imparts to it unprecedented scale at both the national and international levels and intensifies its reactionary nature and its danger to all mankind. Because of this the task is set of unmasking present-day militarism and revealing the baneful consequences for the cause of peace stemming from the buildup of nuclear and conventional weapons. As was emphasized at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum, "it is essential consistently and persistently to unmask the enemies of peace and progress and the militarist plans of imperialism, first and foremost U.S. imperialism, which today is the source of the threat of nuclear world war that hangs over mankind" (Materials on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 14-15 June 1983, p 74).

At the same time it is essential to unmask the lie about the "Soviet military threat and persistently explain the essence and content of the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact countries and the entire socialist community, which is fighting for a stable and just peace for all the peoples of the earth.

Doctor of philosophical sciences professor A.N. Kochetov. The Reactionary Essence of Clerical Anticommunism and Strengthening Atheistic Indoctrination.

Under the conditions of the activation of the struggle against ideology that is alien to us it is essential to take into account the fact that imperialism's ideological centers are resorting increasingly and more actively to the use of religion as a means of "psychological warfare" against socialism. Religious ideology is essentially profoundly antiscientific. It disorients its followers and objectively promotes a weakening of the workers' social activeness in their struggle for the revolutionary transformation of an exploiter society. It was not happenstance that V.I. Lenin regarded K. Marx' dictum that "religion is the opium of the people" as the cornerstone of Marxism's entire world outlook in the question of religion.

Our class enemies, however, are resorting rather more often to religious ideas. In K.U. Chernenko's report to the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum it was stressed that "imperialism's numerous ideological centers are striving not only to support but also spread religiosity and impart to it an anti-Soviet and nationalist direction. They are counting in particular on religious extremists." (Materials on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 14-15 June 1983, p 60) The ideologues of "psychological warfare" mask their own ideas, hiding behind the name of the motherland, god, the church and so forth. We therefore have every reason for speaking of clerical anticommunism, that is, that variety of anti-communism whose specific features are religious justification for the struggle against communist ideology, and a religious interpretation of social doctrines aimed, on the one hand, at defending and justifying the capitalist system, and on the other, at weakening the socialist system and undermining the authority of socialism.

Many religious centers and organizations such as the Center for the Study of Communism and Religion in Great Britain, the American Center for the Study of Religion and Human Rights in Closed Societies and so forth are engaged in clerical anticommunist activities. In this regard the white emigre groupings "The Karlovatskiy Schism," the "Russian Student Christian Movement" and others are very active. All these organization prepare material for the radio stations that specialize in religious propaganda: Radio Vatican, Radio Monte Carlo (Monaco), Voice of the Andes (Ecuador), Voice of Friendship (Manila); and also for the Voice of America, Deutschwelle, Radio Liberty, the BBC and other radio stations that that give over a considerable part of their broadcasts to the propaganda of clerical anticommunism. Each day more than 100 hours of broadcasts on the religious theme are transmitted in the languages of the peoples of the USSR.

At the same time clerical anticommunism is used extensively by the press, bringing its product into the USSR and the other socialist countries. In their desire



to exert an ideological influence on believers, including an influence to weaken and neutralize the effect of Marxist-Leninist ideology on them, the clericals make use of various forums and contacts with people in the sphere of sports, culture and tourism. Using lies and slander against our policy in the field of religion and the church and distorting the tasks and methods of scientific-atheistic work and the reasons why Soviet people have turned from religion and the church, they try to destroy Soviet society from within and shake its moral-political unity by singling out people according to their religious denomination and setting believers against atheists.

What, then, are the methods used by clerical anticommunists in their ideological sabotage against the USSR? First and foremost they falsify the position of the church and of believers in our country. As a rule the point of departure for any anti-Soviet act perpetrated in the name of religion is the myth about the "age-old religiosity" of the peoples of Russia. The Russian people are called the "people of God," and the Russian spiritual and religious tradition is supposed to live on among the broad masses of the population, in "sharp contradiction" to the ideology of Marxism-Leninism. The ideologues of anticommunism even try to depict contemporary Soviet literature and Soviet art as "a yearning after God." The sincere support by the absolute majority of ministers of religion for our state's domestic and foreign policies is interpreted by the foreign centers as in fact a masking of their "hostile" attitude to our policies. The foreign centers pay special concern to the small numbers of groups of religious extremists (the "proselyting" Baptists, the "reformist" Seventh Day Adventists, the Jehovah's Witnesses and others), whose actions we cut short here. Bourgeois propaganda presents this as the "annihilation of believers," a "ban on religious activity," "suffering for the faith" and so forth.

Trying to discredit socialism and poison the consciousness of Soviet people with slander against our reality, bourgeois propaganda pays much attention to the theme of nationalism and religion. In the concepts of clerical anti-communism citizens' nationality is regarded as an allegiance on their part to a given religion: for Russians this is the Orthodox Church, for Lithuanians the Catholic Church, for Tatars and Uzbeks, Islam, for Jews, Judaism, for Germans, the Mennonite sect and so forth. Disregarding the facts and falsifying national policy and its truly humanist essence, our adversaries try to bring people of different religious persuasion into conflict, and with slanderous fabrications about the "policy of colonization" pursued by the Russians against the other peoples of our country they try to whip up nationalism.

In connection with the approaching millennium of the introduction of Christianity in Rus', the religious circles among Russian emigres united in a religious-political organization that calls itself "the Russian Church Abroad" (the "Karlovat'skiy Schism") are making use of this event as a pretext for whipping up an anti-Soviet hysteria in the emigre medium and for intensifying its anti-communist activity. In 1977 a commission was set up to make preparations for this event, and in 1978 the press organ of this commission--the journal RUSSKOYE VOZROZHDENIYE, designed also for illegal distribution in the Soviet Union--started publication. The activities of the commission and the journal testify to the fact that this church jubilee is merely a pretext for activating diversionary activity aimed against the Soviet people. Even in its first edition the journal



announced that its ideological banner is hatred for communism, and it gave over its pages to malicious statements by extremist renegades calling on the imperialist circles in the West to organize a "general crusade against satanic communism."

Of late the foreign reactionary ecclesiastical emigres have activated propaganda of the ideas of monarchism, linking this with anticommunist activity. The goal has been set of restoring a system of monarchism in our country, dedicated to Orthodoxy and relying on the church. The task has been set of "re-Christianizing Russia" and "restoring the ideals of holy Rus'."

Falsification of the past is used extensively: relations between church and people are idealized and in this way an attempt is made to show the nonviability of socialist society, which allegedly is at variance with centuries of historical tradition.

Finally, western propaganda is spreading more intensely the slander to the effect that a "religious revival" is taking place in the USSR and that there is a reawakening in people of the need for religion, especially among young people and the intelligentsia. In confirmation of this they cite the fact of the current interest in our country's historical past, and to the monuments of its culture, especially in church architecture and cult objects of artistic value.... However, the increased interest in cultural memorabilia can in no way be interpreted as a growth in religiosity. This distorts our reality.

Note should be made of yet another circumstance: the link has been strengthened between a number of the religious organizations in the West and the state organs engaged directly in open anticommunist and anti-Soviet policies. The director of the "American Atheistic Center" (Austin, Texas), (G. Murray), spoke about this in an interview with a NOVOSTI correspondent and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent Vl. Simonov: "With the arrival of the Reagan administration, clerical forces are being increasingly raised up by our state institutions. In essence, the separation between church and state long ago became blurred. Who are clericals and who state ministers, where is it religion and where policy? Today you cannot see the line between them..." (LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 16 May 1984). In fact, in recent years the extreme rightist Protestant organizations, the so-called Fundamentalists, have unleashed an anti-Soviet campaign in the United States. Using today's mass information media they are creating a definite religious "background" for the new spirals in the arms [race] and production of the latest weapons of mass destruction. The Fundamentalists are playing by no means the most minor role in putting forward as U.S. presidential candidates the most reactionary representatives of the imperialist circles.

In the struggle against clerical anticommunism it is essential to raise the level of atheistic indoctrination and to pay more attention to questions of atheism in all elements of training and educational work in the VUZ's. This is particularly important for the VUZ's that train the teachers who are called upon to shape the high moral and business qualities and the communist convictions of the rising generation.

Candidate of philosophical sciences docent L.V. Topchiy. Questions of Organizing Counterpropaganda in the VUZ's.

It was noted at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum that in the international arena the ideological struggle has been sharply intensified. Aggressive imperialist circles are waging "psychological warfare" against the USSR and the other countries of socialism. They are engaging in attempts to organize against these countries a real information and propaganda intervention, carrying out ideological sabotage. Many subversive actions are aimed directly at Soviet youth, including the student youth. Here, it is impossible not to see that sometimes bourgeois propaganda does exert some influence on part of youth, even though it is a very small part. It was noted at the Komsomol Central Committee 5th Plenum (July 1983) that "youth is the main target of ideological sabotage. We cannot but be concerned about the lack of political vigilance among some young men and women, and their naive credulity with regard to mass information sources and various kinds of conjectures and rumors." ("Documents of the Komsomol Central Committee 5th Plenum." Moscow, 1983, p 23)

Taking this into account, the CPSU deems it necessary constantly to inculcate political vigilance in Soviet people, particularly the youth, along with implacability toward hostile views and the ability to withstand the ideological sabotage of the class enemy; and to instill in them a lasting immunity against views and morals alien to us, and to create within the country a well thought-out, unified, dynamic and effective system of counterpropaganda.

In the year since the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum brochures and articles have appeared dealing with counterpropaganda and its essence and organization, including in the VUZ. Soviet researchers have made a definite contribution in work on counterpropaganda problems. In order to further develop work on current problems of counterpropaganda and improve its effectiveness, more extensive use must be made of the ideas of V.I. Lenin most directly related to this. In our opinion special importance attaches to Lenin's proposition that our propaganda should respond to the intrigues of the bourgeoisie and be able to defend itself against bourgeois propaganda with counterpropaganda. V.I. Lenin emphasized that communists "should struggle tirelessly against any kind of bourgeois ideology" (V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works, Vol 6, p 269), and against "opportunism, reformism and social chauvinism and similar bourgeois influences and currents..." (V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works, Vol 40, p 240.

Effectiveness in the struggle against bourgeois propaganda and against the penetration of bourgeois ideas into the consciousness of students depend on the content of all the multifaceted ideological-indoctrination work done in the Soviet VUZ.

The system of communist indoctrination and the socialist reality established within the VUZ's exert a powerful influence on the political and moral consciousness and the spiritual world of the Soviet student body. At the Moscow Institute of the National Economy imeni G.V. Plekhanov ideological-indoctrination work is conducted in accordance with a comprehensive plan for the communist indoctrination of students during the entire period of their studies at the VUZ, and also according to special recommendations on strengthening the world-outlook direction in the teaching of economics and the technical and natural sciences.

Counterpropaganda is an integral part of the entire training and educational process and is aimed at active opposition against bourgeois ideology and imperialist propaganda. Study of the social sciences by students plays an important role in counterpropaganda. The militant nature and effectiveness of counterpropaganda are achieved when the teacher at lectures and seminar studies skillfully links Marxist-Leninist theory with practical work in the building of socialism and communism and also deeply reveals the reactionary essence of present-day imperialism and bourgeois ideology and the unsoundness of the falsifications of the domestic and foreign policies of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties in the socialist countries.

The role of the department of social sciences, and particularly the department of scientific communism, is undoubtedly growing in the conducting of counterpropaganda in the VUZ because it is the teachers in these departments who must conduct the special courses on counterpropaganda for students on all courses, lead the counterpropaganda seminars in the social sciences professions' faculty, and train young lecturers in counterpropaganda in the young lecturer schools. However, there are still unresolved problems here. First, the subject matter of the special courses is ill-assorted, and second, the number of hours allocated by the VUZ's for conducting these special courses varies between 10 and 60. Evidently this requires the attention of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education.

At our VUZ the special courses are held by all the social sciences departments. This academic year department of scientific communism has been running a special course that covers subjects such as "The Aggressive Foreign Policy of Imperialism," "The Antipeople Essence of Bourgeois Democracy," "The Reactionary Essence of Anticommunism," "Means of Ideological Sabotage by Imperialism Against the USSR. Ways and Methods in Imperialist Propaganda," "The Fundamental Antagonism of the Socialist and Bourgeois Ways of Life," "Youth and the Ideological Struggle at the Present Stage," "The Tasks of the Komsomol Organizations in the Struggle Against Bourgeois Ideology and Propaganda and Ideological Sabotage," and so forth.

At the same time counterpropaganda activity at the VUZ is inconceivable without a strengthening of the world-outlook direction in the economic, technical and natural disciplines. This is why at our institute special recommendations have been drawn up on this question; all the departments at our VUZ have taken part in this work. But this work still needs improvement.

Counterpropaganda activity at the VUZ also includes the unmasking of propaganda hostile to socialism, propaganda aims and methods, and the neutralization of ideological sabotage aimed primarily against student youth in the socialist countries. Counterpropaganda presupposes the inculcation in every student of a feeling for politics and the ability to lay bare the slanderous fabrications of bourgeois propaganda and to recognize in good time and unmask its antiscientific ideas and inventions. But the main task is to instill in every student political vigilance and implacability toward bourgeois ideology and revisionism. It is important that the ideological convictions of students be combined with the habits and skills to conduct counterpropaganda activity in the student and production collectives.



Counterpropaganda in the VUZ is a system of organizational, ideological, scientific-methodological and sociopsychological measures of a counterpropaganda nature. The organization of counterpropaganda presupposes consideration of the Leninist principles that envisage a clear-cut distribution of responsibilities, that is, it is essential "to give one person a sentimental violin, another a fierce double bass, and a third the conductor's baton," (V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works, Vol 8, p 96).

I think that the VUZ council for counterpropaganda and the social sciences departments should help the Komsomol committees to determine their place in the counterpropaganda system. The Komsomol Central Committee 7th Plenum (March 1984) emphasized that "increasing significance is attaching to the counterpropaganda activity of the Komsomol committees and instilling political vigilance in young men and women. This matter is of paramount importance." (KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Mar 1984)

Speaking at the All-Army Conference of Komsomol Secretaries, K.U. Chernenko said: "It is important first and foremost constantly and deeply to delve into those social and ideological processes that are taking place in the youth medium and systematically to analyze them, and to help the Komsomol organizations in selecting the basic directions and the most effective forms of work." (PRAVDA 29 May 1984). These words also apply in full to counterpropaganda activity in the VUZ, which requires a competent and creative approach and the use of flexible methods for ideological work among the student youth. Extensive opportunities are being opened up by combined counterpropaganda activity by the social sciences departments and the VUZ Komsomol. It is done using forms such as the "political clubs," "political satire theaters," "agitation brigades," "discotheques for political songs," the "international friendship clubs," "roundtable meetings" and so forth.

Counterpropaganda work in the student medium should take into account the fact that along with obvious juggling and falsifications and the methods of psychological pressure, imperialist propaganda is resorting to veiled influence on the consciousness, attitudes and behavior of youth. Today, counterpropaganda work connected with the unmasking of so-called "mass culture" is vital. In this connection it is important to provide youth with access to the best achievements of Soviet and world literature using all the forms of indoctrination activity, and at the same time to prevent "the youth medium from being penetrated by political apathy, lack of morals, and blind imitation of western fashions." At the same time, in its decree "On Further Improving Party Leadership of the Komsomol and Enhancing Its Role in the Communist Indoctrination of Youth," the CPSU Central Committee has obliged the ideological institutions "to close off all channels through which lack of ideological principles and banality may penetrate literature and art, and to raise a reliable cover against the influence of bourgeois 'mass culture.'" (PRAVDA 7 Jul 1984)

Professor V.F. Glagolev. Urgent Problems of Counterpropaganda.

V.I. Lenin pointed out that the question of the state is not only one of the most complex but also one of the questions most confused by the representatives of bourgeois science, philosophy, jurisprudence, political economy and journalism.



The deliberate distortion of the essence of the bourgeois state and of bourgeois democracy by the bourgeois scholars, political figures and mass information media is explained, as V.I. Lenin pointed out, by the fact that in the capitalist countries the state as a special vehicle used to maintain the dominance of one class over another belongs to the bourgeoisie and serves its interests.

Under present-day conditions the bourgeois state is a political tool of monopoly capital. It protects the interests of capitalist private ownership and maintains relations of exploitation and oppression of the workers by the bourgeoisie with its apparatus of repression--the army, police, gendarmerie and other organs of state power--insures for it an unearned income, and ideologically manipulates public opinion in the interests of the dominant class. And no matter how motley the clothing in which imperialist propaganda may garb the political machine of contemporary bourgeois society, it will not succeed in hiding the class, exploiter nature of bourgeois society and bourgeois democracy. "The forms of the bourgeois state," V.I. Lenin wrote, "are extraordinarily varied but their essence is the same: all these states are in the final analysis, one way or another a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie...." (V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works Vol 33, p 35)

In recent times bourgeois propaganda has been trying to present the present-day bourgeois state and bourgeois democracy in bright colors. Those attributes of power for the monopoly bourgeoisie are extolled in every possible way, and they are hung with bright labels, and all possible kinds of noble epithets are ascribed to them. The works of the bourgeois ideologues and politicians, the pages of the newspapers and journals, and the airways are filled with panegyrics addressed at bourgeois society and its state and democracy as a "free state," a "society of equal rights and opportunities," "a state of general prosperity," "a state of universal democracy," "the free world," "the mass consumption state" and so forth. Inordinate praise is heaped on capitalism, the bourgeois state and democracy by American propaganda led by the President. At the same time the bourgeois ideologues, political figures and mass information media revile socialist society in every possible way, along with the economic, social and political relations prevailing in it, and Marxist-Leninist ideology, and they distort the essence of the socialist state and democracy, the place and role of the CPSU in Soviet society, and the place and role of other communist and workers' parties in the political system of socialism, and slander the domestic and foreign policy of the socialist countries. The favorite and most widely disseminated false labels hung on the socialist countries have now become concepts such as "totalitarian regimes," "iron curtain," "the threat of communism," "the Soviet military threat" and so forth.

In the struggle against bourgeois, anticommunist ideology and propaganda one of the most important tasks is, in my opinion, a correct and comprehensive demonstration of the achievements of socialist society and its advantages over capitalism and the popular and humane nature of its socialist state and democracy, and the reflection of the vital interests of the workers in the policy and activity of the CPSU and the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries. At the same time, the contrast should also reveal in a well-argued manner the true content of the present-day bourgeois state as the dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie, whose antipeople and antihumane essence is constantly growing and tends to develop into an open, totalitarian, fascist

regime. I think that our scholars (the authors of articles and other works) have without justification stopped using the term "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie" with respect to the bourgeois state.

In pieces published in the journal it is useful to show on the basis of analysis of the composition of the bourgeois parliaments what class of society and what strata of the bourgeoisie are represented by the organs of state power in the capitalist countries. There are no, or almost no representatives of the working class, the working peasantry or the progressive intelligentsia in those organs. And as far as the presidents and premiers of the capitalist countries are concerned there can be no question of people from among the workers. It is common knowledge that the expenses of the U.S. presidential candidates are paid for by monopoly groups in the bourgeoisie, and in recent years these costs have reached up to \$50 million.

The antipeople nature of the bourgeois state permeates all its policies and real activity. Bourgeois democracy also reflects the interests of the class of capitalists. V.I. Lenin wrote: "Democracy for an insignificant minority, democracy for the rich--this is what democracy is in a capitalist society." (V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works, Vol 33, p 88). The false nature of bourgeois democracy can already be seen from the fact that, when campaigning for election as president or members of parliament the representatives of the bourgeoisie promise to defend the interests of the electors, but when they come to power they break their promises. Moreover, as a rule the bourgeois constitutions loudly proclaim citizens' rights but they do not guarantee them in real life. For example, the right to work is included in almost all of these constitutions but at the same time in 1983 some 32 million workers were without work in the developed capitalist countries, and of these 25-29 percent were young people; and among the young black men and women in the United States unemployment reached 40 percent. There is your society of "equal opportunities"!

On the pages of the journal it is also essential to show the contrast between socialist society and its state and democracy and bourgeois society and its political system and bourgeois democracy. It is necessary to point out the advantages of socialism's economic system (public ownership of the means of production and the absence of private capital ownership, and hence of exploiter classes), the complete liquidation of economic, class, political, national and spiritual oppression, and the actual equality of the nations and the equal rights of citizens from different classes and social strata in society. It is of enormous importance, particularly for youth and foreign readers, to show the leading and managing role of the CPSU--the core of the political system under developed socialism--in the life of Soviet society, the indestructible unity of the party and the Soviet people, and the rights of citizens guaranteed by the USSR Constitution and insured by the necessary conditions, such as the right to elect or be elected to any state organ, the right to labor, leisure and health, to material provision in old age, to free education and medical services, to enjoy all the achievements of culture and so forth. Not all young people in the USSR, and even less those abroad, know that each year the Soviet state spends about R1,100 for every VUZ student, and that more than 77 percent of students in full-time departments receive state grants. At the same time, in the United States it costs the parents of young men and women receiving a college education \$15,000-20,000.

It has been repeatedly underscored in CPSU documents that present-day capitalism is a sick society. In fact, for the working masses on our planet the political and moral degradation of the top bourgeois leadership and the ruling class in that society is becoming increasingly obvious. Corruption and bribery flourish in the highest organs of state power in the capitalist countries. Leading political figures make unconstrained use of lies, deceit and slander in order to manipulate public opinion. Phenomena such as the elimination of objectionable progressive figures by murder, the organization of court cases for false accusations, and reprisal by imprisonment have become commonplace. All possible kinds of restrictions and bans are imposed for political motives on occupations. Surveillance, telephone tapping and the recording of telephone conversations and maintaining dossiers on millions of citizens are all practised on massive scales. The cult of violence is implanted in every possible way, and the cinema and television propagandize scenes of murder and other horrors. From childhood the educational system maims and corrupts people's consciousness. It instills in them nationalism and racism, chauvinism and individualism, mutual distrust, and a lust for profit, shapes the consciousness of the rising generation in a spirit of anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, and works to make the psychological and world-outlook situation one of disavowal of socialism and Marxism-Leninism. Systematic exposure of the evils of present-day capitalism and criticism of the customs cultivated by the bourgeoisie make up an important direction in counterpropaganda.

American imperialism together with the White House administration is leading the ideological war against the USSR and the other socialist countries and against all the progressive forces of the age. Having lost hope of winning in the competition with socialism under the conditions of peaceful coexistence, reactionary imperialist circles in the United States have set a course toward destroying socialism by military means. Socialism is increasingly often stated to be a random phenomenon in history. Propaganda of nuclear war is conducted openly by the U.S. President and his entourage. The military budgets of the imperialist states are growing at unprecedented rates. New kinds of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction are constantly being developed. The course has been set toward the militarization of space.

The U.S. administration has set itself the goal of achieving military superiority over the USSR and of using a new spiral in the arms race to slow down the rate of economic development in our country and the other socialist countries. The state figures in a number of the capitalist powers are blindly following in the wake of the U.S. administration's militarist foreign policy and have handed over complete control of the territory of their countries to satisfy the vast appetite of this administration and the Pentagon. The United States has taken upon itself the role of world policeman and has covered our planet with a ramified system of military bases and military objects: outside the United States in 32 countries they number more than 1,500, with the permanent presence of about 535,000 servicemen. The U.S. administration does not want agreement with the USSR on questions of the relaxation of international tension, and it has deliberately walked out of negotiations on questions of reducing the number of intermediate-range missiles in Europe and reducing the numbers of strategic missiles. The deployment of U.S. Pershings and cruise missiles in the European capitalist countries is involving the world in a new spiral in the arms race.

As a result of the actions by the United States and the other capitalist countries a very dangerous international situation has been created in the world. It



is reminiscent of situation created by Hitler's fascism in the late Thirties. At that time fascism proclaimed a course of world domination. The U.S. administration is pursuing the same goals. The fascists began impudently to seize the territories of other states. And the U.S. administration announces zones of American interest in more and more regions of the world thousands of kilometers away from U.S. territory. The Nazis stifled progressive forces within the country and on occupied territories. The United States is doing the same in the Near East, Africa and Central America. A henchman of the war monopolies, Hitler unleashed World War II, in which mankind lost 50 million lives, including 20 million in the USSR. The henchman of the U.S. military-industrial complex, Reagan, is also trying to plunge the world into a new war, but this time it is a nuclear war, which could become a catastrophe for the entire planet.

As they fight against the aggressive policy of present-day imperialism, the Soviet people and all peace-loving people in the world remember the lessons of the Great Patriotic War. "The chief of these," it states in the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 40th Anniversary of the Soviet People's Victory in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945," "is that war must be resisted before it starts. Historical experience teaches that in order to safeguard peace cohesive, agreed and active actions are required by all peace-loving forces against the aggressive, adventurist course of imperialism." (PRAVDA 17 Jun 1984).

The struggle for peace and against the nuclear war being hatched by imperialism, primarily U.S. imperialism, is the main direction in counterpropaganda aimed both at Soviet citizens and at the populations of other countries.

\* \* \* \* \*

The following also spoke at the round table discussion: doctor of philosophical sciences professor E.A. Arab-ogly, doctor of philosophical sciences professor V.G. Antonenko, doctor of philosophical sciences professor L.V. Metelitsa, doctor of philosophical sciences professor L.Ye. Serebryakov, and doctor of philosophical sciences B.A. Shabad.

In conclusion the deputy chief editor of the journal, V.F. Glagolev, thanked all those participating in the work of the round table on behalf of the editorial board and the journal's editorial office.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Vysshaya shkola". "Nauchnyy kommunizm", 1984.

9642

CSO: 1807/200



INTERNATIONAL

TASS NOTES ARAB COMMUNISTS' CONCERN OVER JORDAN-PLO ACCORD

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 28 Feb 85 pp 1-3

[Article: "Communist and Workers' Parties of the Arab East Hold a Meeting"]

[Text] Damascus, 27 Feb (TASS)--A meeting of representatives of communist and workers' parties of the Arab East was held here to discuss the situation, which emerged in the region after the signing of the Jordanian-Palestinian agreement in Amman. The meeting also examined the situation in Lebanon after the Israeli troop withdrawal from Saida.

The joint statement adopted by the participants in the meeting points out that the Amman agreement threatens the cause of the Palestinians and the Palestine revolution, deepens the split among the ranks of the Palestine Liberation Organization, leads to a deepening of differences between the Arab states and opens the way to strengthening American-Israeli influence in the region.

It is a consequence of the pressure being brought to bear on the PLO leadership with the aim of forcing on it a capitulatory policy, undermining the national cause of the Arab Palestinian people and splitting the liberation movement of the Arabs. It was signed at a time when United States imperialism is making feverish efforts to establish its undivided rule in the Middle East, is out to eliminate the gains of the Arab peoples, is trying to turn the region into an aggressive base spearheaded against the national liberation movements. The statement notes that the NATO countries and the imperialist circles have welcomed the Amman agreement and U.S. President Reagan described it as a "positive step."

The Amman agreement, the statement goes on to say, flouts the right of the Palestinian people to the creation of an independent state, undermines the right of the PLO to be the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinians. It rejects the decisions of the National Council of Palestine, including its 16th session and the resolution of the Arab summit meeting in Fez. The agreement is a departure from the idea of holding an international conference on the Middle East with the aim of implementing the national aspirations of the Palestinians, in whose work all sides concerned in the Middle East conflict, including a separate delegation of PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine, should participate on a par. While proclaiming by word of mouth "talks under the aegis of an international conference," this

document pursues the aim of coming to separate direct talks, as was the case as a result of the Camp David deal.

The communist and workers' parties of the Arab East are categorically rejecting this agreement, calling for struggle to frustrate it, expressing solidarity with the patriotic Palestinian organisations and leaders, who opposed it. They are expressing firm conviction that an indispensable condition for the implementation of the inalienable national rights of the Arab Palestinian people, attaining a just and lasting peace in the region is withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories, adherence to the decisions of the Fez summit conference and the 16th session of the National Council of Palestine. The statement reaffirms support for the Soviet proposals on Middle East settlement.

The participants in the meeting hailed the victory scored by the fighters of the Lebanese patriotic resistance front, who forced the Israeli occupationists withdraw from Saida. They declared their support for the struggle of the Lebanese people against the Israeli occupation, and for the actions by the population of the Israeli captured West Bank of the Jordan River, the Gaza strip and the Golan Heights against Zionist genocide. The representatives of communist and workers' parties stressed the need for deepening and strengthening the combat alliance of Syria, the Lebanese national patriotic forces and the Palestine Resistance Movement in the struggle against the plans and conspiracies of United States imperialism and Zionism.

The statement points out that only the unity of all Arab progressive and patriotic forces and governments, elimination of minor differences between them, strengthening of relations with the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community are a guarantee of successful rebuff on the onset of imperialism, Zionism and reaction in the Middle East.

(PRAVDA, February 28. In full.)

CSO: 1812/171

## INTERNATIONAL

### FURTHER COMMENTARIES ASSAIL SDI

#### U.S. Plans Described

PM271030 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 8, Feb 85 pp 25-27

[Interview with Soviet expert Aleksey Karinin by Dmitriy Pogorzelskiy: "The Star Wars Menace"]

[Text] Question: By commencing its plans to militarize outer space, the United States is striving for military superiority at the expense of other countries' security. Is this aim attainable?

Answer: As far as we know, the tendency towards militarizing outer space has manifested itself in the United States from the very beginning of the space age. The United States objected to Soviet proposals made at the United Nations in the second half of the 1950's and designed to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space. These proposals were not realized precisely because of the negative stand taken by the West.

This striving to exploit scientific and technological progress for militarist purposes is very typical of American policy. It is enough to recall the history of the harnessing of nuclear energy. First the atomic bomb was made and only then were atomic power plants started. As soon as it got hold of the terrible atomic weapons, Washington set about whipping up international tension and pursuing power politics.

These are all signs of an old syndrome--the yearning for military superiority. Now that rough military-strategic parity exists between the USSR and the United States, the Warsaw Treaty and the NATO countries, certain circles in the United States are pinning their hopes of upsetting this balance on outer space in particular. They are banking on the scientific and technological potential of the United States, on its economic capabilities.

But whoever harbours such plans would do well to remember that all this is a repeat of history. There were plans to prevent the Soviet Union recovering from the Nazi aggression, to achieve decisive superiority over it on the basis of Washington's temporary atomic monopoly. By their heroic work the Soviet people foiled these plans. Then there were plans to achieve superiority by deploying



bombers on a mass scale, and when the missile era set in, hopes were pinned on land- and sea-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. But Washington did not achieve what it wanted. So the next move was to fit missiles with MIRV warheads (multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles) in the 1960's, and after that there began the deployment of a new lethal strategic offensive weapon—the long-range cruise missile (1970's). The USSR has taken measures to counter the increased threat to its security.

Now Washington is turning its eyes to outer space in the hope that the road to superiority lies there. But history offers convincing evidence of the unattainability of such hopes. The very idea of superiority is unfeasible and essentially untenable. On the other hand, the balance of forces is a reliable guarantee of peace in present-day conditions. And the USSR will not allow anyone to upset this balance. The necessary weapons will be developed to counter the American space strike weapons.

But the USSR is totally against any continuation of the arms race. All its proposals are directed at putting an end to military rivalry and preventing the militarization of outer space. That such a danger exists is evidenced by the American plans for creating a large-scale ABM system.

Question: How do the American strategists visualize this system in practice?

Answer: The "theory" is presented in the United States as follows: Several ABM layers are created, and each hits a certain percentage of the ballistic missiles trying to reach targets, thereby eliminating the hypothetical enemy's nuclear potential.

Basically, there can be three main ABM layers: the first deals with missiles as they are launched; the second while they are in mid-flight, and the third when they reach the final stage of their trajectory.

Research and practical work to develop new technology for use in a large-scale ABM system are in full swing in the United States. Special hopes are pinned on the so-called directed energy weapons. These can be termed beam weapons because they hit targets with a laser beam, or a stream of high energy particles of atomic hydrogen, deuterium or tritium, or a microwave beam. The ABM beam systems are to be used in outer space where they are particularly effective.

As we can see, this is an exceptionally sophisticated and costly system.

Question: What is the military-political purport of the project?

Answer: U.S. propaganda is trying hard to prove the "peaceful" nature of the programme. It is said that a space-based ABM system will strengthen "deterrence," that is, defence. In reality, the large-scale ABM system is conceived as a supplement to offensive strategic arms, as a means of ensuring that the first nuclear strike is delivered with impunity. Under cover of a space based ABM system it is intended to deprive the other side of the possibility to retaliate.

Hence the huge destabilizing potential of the American "strategic defense initiative." By placing a large-scale ABM system in outer space, Washington hopes to get an instrument of blackmail against other nations. That is why, as it develops its ABM programme in a hurry, Washington continues to deploy new MX intercontinental ballistic missiles and long-range cruise missiles of all types of basing, to build new strategic bombers and to rearm its fleet of missile-carrying submarines.

Question: Will the creation of the above-mentioned systems be a violation of the 1972 Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of ABM systems?

Answer: Yes, it will. U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger has publicly declared that in order to implement its programme the United States is prepared to revise or even renounce the ABM treaty. Similar statements have also come from the well-known exponent of the "strategic defence initiative" in the United States, Colin Gray, an adviser at the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

However, even the statement of the intention to establish a large-scale ABM system with some of its elements based in space--and such a statement has been made by President Reagan--directly contradicts the letter and spirit of the treaty itself and the provisions of Article 1, under which each party undertakes not to deploy ABM systems for defence of the territory of its country and not to provide a base for such a defence. There would be a flagrant violation of another important limitation contained in the treaty's Article 5--not to develop, test or deploy space-based ABM systems or components.

So a large-scale ABM system with elements of space basing can be deployed only at the price of renouncing the 1972 treaty. This is added evidence of Washington's flippant attitude towards the commitments it assumes under international agreements.

Question: It is possible to stop this process, to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space?

Answer: This can be done and it must be done. That is how the Soviet side views the issue.

A practical possibility of adopting effective measures to prevent an arms race in outer space and stop it on earth is afforded by the Soviet-American talks due to open in Geneva on 12 March. In the present circumstances these talks offer the only possible hope of solving the problem of nuclear and space arms. Today it is impossible to limit, and still less to reduce, nuclear arms without taking effective measures to prevent the militarization of space. This interconnection is clearly recorded in the joint Soviet-American statement on the results of the Gromyko-Shultz meeting in Geneva.

What is needed now is honest adherence to this agreement, adherence in practice to all its components. And, of course, any steps obstructing constructive talks are impermissible.

As for the Soviet Union, it is entirely in favour of this. "A positive outcome of the new Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms," President Chernenko stressed, "would favourably influence the world situation, would greatly contribute to solving the cardinal problems of today.

"The Soviet Union will work in this direction, will seek meaningful and definite results in Geneva."

The Soviet side expects the United States to take the same stand.

#### Reagan Arguments Refuted

PM250926 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Feb 85 First Edition p 5

[Article by Aleksey Arbatov, doctor of historical sciences and expert of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat: "Reflections Before Geneva; The Mirages of 'Strategic Defense'"]

[Text] For 40 years now the danger of nuclear annihilation has hung over mankind like a terrible curse. Total catastrophe can occur not only as a result of deliberate, preplanned aggression, but also as a result of a crisis situation in one of the many flash points on the planet getting out of control, or owing to a strategic miscalculation on the part of staffs, unsanctioned actions by operators at the missile control console, or computer error at the command post.

People are tired of living under the oppression of the nuclear threat. The human mind cannot reconcile itself to the thought that everything that we have created and love could, in a matter of minutes, turn into scorched ruins and nuclear ashes. This is the reason for the unprecedentedly broad antinuclear and antimissile movement which has encompassed the whole world in recent years.

But at the same time people whose aims have nothing in common with delivering mankind from the nuclear threat are trying in a most cynical manner, to exploit man's natural desire to finally find a refuge from the boundless destructive force and reach of nuclear weapons. I am referring to the so-called U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative," first mentioned in President Reagan's 23 March 1983 speech. In this speech plans were announced for the creation of a large-scale antimissile (ABM) defense including space-based laser emitters.

Well, despite all the doubts about the technical and strategic aspects of these plans, the psychological calculation of the president and his aides was simple and very precise. It cannot be bad, surely, to obtain security not by means of offensive nuclear weapons but rather through systems which provide a reliable defense against them. It would appear so much humane to spend money on means to destroy missiles in flight rather than on means to kill people and destroy material assets. If ABM defense systems make nuclear missile weapons ineffective, this will, as it were, make it easier to scrap offensive means. However, even if that does not happen, and nuclear war should break out, then the antimissile systems will prevent total destruction.



At first glance these arguments look attractive. The problem is, however, that they are as far from the truth as the Hollywood adventure film "Star Wars" which has provided the label for the Reagan administration's "defense initiative" is removed from real life. There is direct evidence that this is a perfectly plain falsification, a deliberate attempt on the part of the president, or those who advise him, to mislead the public.

Strenuous attempts are being made to impress on people that it is possible to obtain protection against nuclear weapons by spending money on the development of increasingly exotic types of arms (at the initial stage 26 billion is being requested for research and development--which in itself exceeds the cost of, for instance, the entire "MX" or "Trident" programs--and in the longer term the expenditure for the multiechelon antimissile system could top 1 trillion dollars!) Essentially, the advocates of the ABM defense system put forward the idea that, rather than by means of a consistent struggle for peace and patient negotiations, security can be achieved through the development and deployment of fundamentally new and increasingly sophisticated types of arms. And this is probably the biggest deception of the nuclear age.

The point is that even in purely theoretical terms there is no, nor can there be, a weapon that is 100 percent reliable and effective. Strategic planners have learned to adapt to these circumstances in one way or another. But matters take a completely new turn when it comes to antimissile defense.

In view of the colossal destructive force of even a relatively small quantity of nuclear weapons, an antimissile system to protect the population must either be 100 percent reliable or it becomes completely meaningless. The technical side of possible future antimissile systems, and especially of their fundamentally new orbital laser versions, is at the moment extremely vague. But even if a partially effective system proved feasible in the end, its consequences would be completely different from those promised by U.S. administration spokesmen.

The development and deployment of ABM defense systems would, above all, encourage a sharp buildup of offensive nuclear arms and the development of means to counter ABM defense systems. Existing arms limitation agreements would collapse and the adoption of future accords on these questions would inevitably be thwarted. The threat of war would sharply increase. Explaining the essence of the U.S. "defense initiative," K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, pointed out in his replies to questions from the U.S. CNN television company: "The use of the term 'defense' is juggling with words. In its essence this concept is offensive, or rather aggressive.... The objective is to acquire the possibility of delivering a nuclear strike in the hope of impunity, sheltering from retribution behind an antimissile 'shield'."

The U.S. military-industrial complex' programs, and in particular the "Star Wars" projects, have been widely denounced by the world public and criticized by realistically minded bourgeois politicians. Studies by authoritative experts from the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat and also by their U.S. colleagues from the League of Concerned

Scientists, the Congress scientific and technical assessment board, and the Federation of U.S. Scientists have demonstrated on the basis of facts and figures the flimsiness and dangerous nature of plans to crank up the antimissile arms race.

This explains why the pioneers of the "defense initiative" have changed their tactics of late. In order to clarify the limits of the effectiveness of ABM defense systems they propose, for the time being, to conduct intensive research and development work. And if it proves that only a partially effective ABM system is feasible, they are proposing that it be built for ... the defense of U.S. strategic means against the mythical threat of a "disarming strike." But even this new reasoning proves flawed on closer examination.

The whole world knows that there is no such thing as a "Soviet threat." The USSR has pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, while the United States and NATO stubbornly refuse to follow suit. But even if warped strategic minds in Washington conceive a nuclear attack on the United States as likely, the construction of ABM defense systems cannot be justified by reasons of a retaliatory strike. After all, one of the three components of the U.S. nuclear triad alone, the naval missile forces, now have some 6,000 nuclear warheads deployed, more than half of which are constantly in a state of operational readiness on the oceans. These means are in any case not subject to strategic missile strikes and cannot be shielded by antimissile defense.

The ABM defense system which is being proposed now is by no means needed by the United States to deliver a retaliatory strike but rather as potential for unleashing "limited or protracted" nuclear war and is intended to shield the means necessary to conduct precisely this kind of operation using "MX" and "Midgetman" missiles, B-1 and "Stealth" bombers, antisatellite systems, and a sophisticated system to control all these weapons.

It emerges that even according to the new version the antimissile programs are based on by no means benevolent considerations. The doctrine of "limited or protracted" nuclear war guarantees an endless defensive and offensive arms race and the further exacerbation of the danger of a nuclear conflict being unleashed.

And finally, it must not be forgotten that the ABM defense options which are currently being put forward in the United States would remove all restraints imposed by the ABM Defense Treaty and would thus wreck the main agreement on which the whole existing system and process of strategic arms limitation is based. The last restraining factor on the nuclear missile race would be removed.

The advocates of ABM defense are playing a dishonest game with words, continually "juggling" arguments and facts. Even more dangerous are the practical measures being developed behind this screen aimed in effect at anything but ensuring security. The path to security leads in a completely different direction, it is of a different order. It is outlined in the Soviet-American accord reached in Geneva on talks which will begin 12 March. This accord, K. U. Chernenko pointed out, "contains the correct and, I would say, the only possible way in present conditions of resolving problems pertaining to nuclear and space weapons." An increasing number of people throughout the world and in the United States itself are becoming aware of this truth despite the tricks of the Washington schemers.

NATIONAL

STALIN'S PLAN FOR POSTWAR ARRANGEMENT OF EUROPE, 1941-1943

Moscow NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 84 (signed to press 30 Aug 84) pp 43-62

[Article by V. K. Volkov: "At the Source of the Soviet Program for the Postwar Arrangement of the Peace in Europe (1941-1943)"]

[Text] In Soviet historiography there is not a single major work on the history of the foreign policy of the USSR during the period of the Great Patriotic War that does not touch upon various aspects of the Soviet program for the postwar arrangement of the peace and security in Europe. These problems have been analyzed in a number of summational collective research works by Soviet scientists<sup>1</sup>, as well as in monographs<sup>2</sup> and memoirs<sup>3</sup>. The basic attention is devoted to the struggle waged by Soviet diplomacy for the implementation of the program for the postwar arrangement of peace and security in Europe at the final stage of the war and during the first postwar years. However, for the time being there are no special research works that have considered the questions of the genesis of the Soviet postwar arrangement of the peace<sup>4</sup>.

Western bourgeois literature gives a distorted picture of the process of elaborating the program for postwar settlement<sup>5</sup>. The central place in many research works is given to a demonstration of the difference in the principles of peaceful settlement that were advanced by the Western powers and by the Soviet Union, with the Soviet program being treated, as a rule, in a distorted form, and the actual peace-loving intentions of Soviet diplomacy being deliberately falsified<sup>6</sup>. In the conflict between the conceptions of peaceful settlement and postwar arrangement that were advanced by the Western powers and the USSR as early as the war years, many bourgeois authors view the deeply underlying source of the "Cold War" between countries with different sociopolitical systems<sup>7</sup>. The works of bourgeois authors frequently contain fabrications about the "secret" goals of Moscow, which had allegedly succeeded in outwitting the "credulous" political figures of England and especially the United States.

The question of the study of the genesis of the Soviet program for peaceful settlement and the postwar arrangement of the peace during the years of the Great Patriotic War is of great importance not only from the point of view of the struggle against the bourgeois falsifications, but also from the point of



view of the further deepening of our knowledge and ideas about the diplomatic history of World War II, and about the nature of the anti-Hitlerite coalition and the significance of the program goals and tasks for the cooperation among its leading powers. In Soviet historiographic literature there has already been expressed the idea to the effect that the lack, during the first two years of the Great Patriotic War, of a general coordinated platform among the basic participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition with regard the most important problems of the postwar arrangement of the peace, as well as the lack of desire on the part of British and American diplomacy to discuss those questions with the Soviet government, reflected the striving of the Western allies to put the USSR in an unequal position<sup>8</sup>.

In this article an attempt will be made to throw light, against the background of the formation of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, upon the basic factors in the activity of the Soviet government that was aimed at elaborating the program for the postwar arrangement of the peace. Its chronological confines encompass the period from the beginning of the Great Patriotic War to the publication of the Soviet program regarding this question, in November 1943.

Hitlerite Germany's attack on the USSR and the beginning of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet nation fundamentally changed the international situation and the military-political and military-strategic position in the world. The entry of the USSR into the war definitively gave the war an antifascist, liberating nature on the part of the countries that were fighting against the fascist bloc, and became a powerful incentive for the growth of the democratic and antifascist forces everywhere. It opened up prospects for victory over the fascist bloc headed by Nazi Germany, and created the objective prerequisites for the formation of an anti-Hitlerite coalition.

The task of creating a broad antifascist coalition became, from the first days of the Great Patriotic War, the chief concern of the Soviet government. That task was formulated for the first time in a speech by the Chairman of the State Defense Committee, I. V. Stalin, on 3 July 1941. "The purpose of this nationwide patriotic war against the fascist oppressors," that speech stated, "is not only the elimination of the danger that is hanging over our country, but also the providing of aid to all the peoples of Europe that are groaning under the yoke of German fascism... Our war for the freedom of our homeland will fuse together with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic freedoms. This will be a single front of the peoples that stand up for freedom against enslavement and the threat of enslavement on the part of Hitler's fascist armies"<sup>9</sup>. In a more concrete form the idea of creation of the anti-Hitlerite coalition was expressed by I. V. Stalin and V. M. Molotov on 8 and 12 July 1941 in discussions with the British ambassador in Moscow, S. Kripps<sup>10</sup>.

The partial concretization of the task of rendering aid to the peoples of Europe was contained in a telegram that was sent on 3 July 1941 by the USSR NKID [People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs] to the Soviet ambassador in England, A. M. Mayskiy, in which it was noted that the USSR was in favor of the restoration of the Czechoslovakian and Yugoslavian states, and also the creation of an independent Polish state within the confines of national

Poland, and it was especially emphasized that the question of the nature of the state regime in those countries was their internal matter<sup>11</sup>.

The initial steps in the development of relations among the great powers that were acting against fascist aggression were taken as early as the end of June and the beginning of July 1941. On 12 July an Agreement was signed in Moscow between the governments of the USSR and Great Britain concerning joint actions in the war against Germany, which agreement went into effect immediately. It contained the pledge by the contracting sides to "render to one another assistance and support of every kind," and also not to conclude any "armistice or peace treaty except by mutual consent." Simultaneously negotiations were under way with the United States. On 2 August 1941 those negotiations ended with the conclusion of an agreement governing trade relations between the USSR and the United States and they were accompanied by an exchange of notes, in which it was clearly stated that the threat to the security and independence of all the peace-loving peoples on the part of the aggressor created "a commonality of interests of the state defense of those peoples"<sup>12</sup>. As a whole, that agreement was a kind of "American equivalent" of the Soviet-British agreement of 12 July 1941, inasmuch as it officially confirmed the cooperation between the USSR and the United States<sup>13</sup>. The Soviet-British and Soviet-American agreements laid the first stones in the foundation of the anti-Hitlerite coalition and served as the point of departure for organizing the cooperation among its leading powers.

However, from the very beginning of the cooperation among the Allies, problems began to arise and those problems, with the passage of time, were formed as two lines within the anti-Hitlerite coalition with regard to the basic questions that were the object of the joint policy of its participants: the nature of the relations among the members of the coalition, the definition of the goals of the war, and the elaboration of the basic principles for postwar settlement. These two lines reflected the difference in the nature of the sociopolitical arrangement of the countries that were part of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, rested upon opposing foreign-policy conceptions and plans, and were based on their previous policy.

By that time World War II had already lasted almost two years, and the war had already drawn into its orbit many countries that differed from one another with regard to their social systems, political principles, and their interests in the struggle against the common enemy. The establishment of smooth relations as allies between the socialist state and the large group of capitalist countries, the creation of a single front of peoples in the struggle against fascism, thus represented an extremely difficult and complicated task. In order to resolve that task it was necessary not only to coordinate the military plans and the joint efforts, but also to achieve complete clarity in the questions about the purposes of the war and about the nature of the political arrangement of the peace and its security during the postwar period. It was only on that basis that a solid antifascist coalition could be created.

What situation did Soviet diplomacy encounter in matters concerning the goals of the war and the postwar arrangement of the peace at the very beginning of the Great Patriotic War?

The problems that were posed were discussed by the governments, political parties, and individual figures in all the combatant countries, as well as the United States during the period of the "strange war." On 23 October 1939 the French government made a proposal to Great Britain that they discuss the problem of the goals of the war. In a French memorandum the thesis was advanced that the Allies would have to do the impossible to assure that Germany would never be able to violate the peace in Europe again<sup>14</sup>. In a reply memorandum from the British government, dated 20 December 1939, that thesis met approval, but the idea was expressed that, inasmuch as it was impossible to foresee the circumstances that would develop by the moment of Germany's defeat, it was undesirable to consider any territorial problems. The authors of the memorandum, citing the results of World War I, developed the idea to the effect that one of the weaknesses of the Versailles peace settlement lay in the creation of a number of small national states in Central and Southeast Europe, which were not "viable" either in the military or the economic sense. Therefore, in the event of the future peaceful settlement, it would be necessary to stipulate the forms for their closer alliance, at least the system of their financial and economic cooperation. It was that kind of cooperation that the government of Great Britain intended to encourage. Simultaneously that government refused to discuss the question of Germany's future as being something premature<sup>15</sup>. An analysis of the basic principles in this memorandum shows that in the British ruling circles there still predominated the pre-Munich politicians, who were guided chiefly by their anti-Soviet attitudes and who were inclined to making a deal with Germany.

As a result of the Anglo-French negotiations, an agreement was signed on 28 March 1940, which contained pledges not to conclude a separate peace or armistice. The agreement also emphasized that the peace conditions must provide effective and prolonged guarantees of their security, and stated the necessity to continue cooperation in all spheres after the conclusion of peace<sup>16</sup>.

As early as the beginning of World War II in France influential political circles (De Monzi, and others) were developing plans for the restoration of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, which was viewed by them as being the best solution of the Central European problem. French diplomacy even established contacts with Otto Habsburg<sup>17</sup>. British diplomacy initially took a positive attitude to these plans, but then rejected the idea of the restoration of the Habsburgs, giving the preference to the development of plans for various European federations and confederations<sup>18</sup>.

The further expansion of the sphere of military actions, the defeat of France and its departure from the war, and the seizure and enslavement by Hitlerite Germany of a number of independent European states not only change the course of the war, but also had an effect upon its nature: the tendencies that began to grow and become predominant in it were the antifascist, liberation tendencies, and broader and broader masses were drawn into the struggle. .pa However, no major changes occurred in the plans for postwar settlement that the previous political agencies and social segments had engaged in.



The greatest amount of participation in the question of postwar settlement was demonstrated by the governments in exile. For example, on 11 November 1940, on the anniversary of the Compiègne armistice, there was published in London, on the initiative of the Polish government in exile, a Polish-Czechoslovakian declaration concerning the intention to create in the future a Central European federation<sup>19</sup>. Soon negotiations began, concerning the creation of a Polish-Czechoslovakian confederation as the nucleus of a broader political association, the plans for which were backed by British diplomacy<sup>20</sup>. In order to develop these plans, the Polish government in exile created a special Bureau for Political, Economic, and Legal Research (Military Goals), which was headed originally by Minister of Justice M. Seida<sup>21</sup>.

A further enlivenment in the development of the problems of the military goals and the postwar settlement occurred in the spring and summer of 1941 and was linked with the fact that the capitals of the Western powers had received information from their intelligence services about Nazi Germany's preparation for an attack on the USSR<sup>22</sup>. On 27 May 1941 President Roosevelt made a statement that the United States "will not tolerate Hitlerite dominance in the world" and declared that the country had been put on an "unlimited emergency status"<sup>23</sup>. In addition to the previously adopted Lend-Lease law, the statement by President Roosevelt laid the foundation for a new stage in U. S. policy<sup>24</sup>.

On 29 May 1941 in the House of Commons British Foreign Secretary A. Eden made a statement in which he dwelt on the problem of the German threat to the security of the European nations and devoted much space to the hypothetical consideration of the questions of the economic restoration of Europe after the war<sup>25</sup>. On 12 June 1941 an inter-Allies conference was held in London, the participants of which were Great Britain, the British dominions, and the governments in exile of the European countries that had been occupied by the fascists. The conference was convoked on the initiative of the Polish government in exile, which wanted to secure additional reciprocal pledges from the other countries, primarily Great Britain, concerning cooperation during the period of "the war and the peace"<sup>26</sup>, in which pledges, however, the Polish emigre circles had included their own content, which was of an anti-Soviet nature.

The forceful activity of Soviet diplomacy at the very beginning of the Great Patriotic War immediately ascertained all the nuances of the political intentions of the individual states and governments that had come out against the fascist bloc. The efforts to create a single front of nations and to organize cooperation with the governments of other countries manifested themselves in various forms: with a number of countries, diplomatic relations were established or restored, and diplomatic and economic cooperation in the struggle against the common enemy was organized. On 18 July 1941 an agreement was signed between the governments of the USSR and Czechoslovakia, which opened up the path for the development of political and military cooperation between those two allied states in the struggle against the fascist bloc<sup>27</sup>.

In implementing the measures for establishing cooperation with other states that were in a state of war against Nazi Germany, Soviet diplomacy also came

up against manifestations of arrant anti-Sovietism. The ones who remained the most frenzied anti-Soviets were the Polish bourgeois emigre circles. Most of them had made no conclusions from the catastrophe into which Poland had been plunged in September 1939 by the policy of the "preventive" regime of Pilsudski's followers. From the very beginning of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, they hoped for the defeat of the Soviet forces and constructed all their plans on the assumption that the USSR and Germany would completely exhaust one another. During the very first contacts with Soviet diplomacy in July 1941, the Polish government in exile made claims to land in the Western Ukraine and western Belorussia. British diplomacy demonstrated an "understanding" of the anti-Soviet premises of the reactionary Polish government in exile. The conclusion of the Soviet-Polish agreement of 30 July 1941 was accompanied by the handing over of a note from Great Britain to the Polish government in exile, in which it was stated that the British government did not recognize any territorial changes that occurred after August 1939. That note was read aloud in the British House of Commons, although in replies to questions from A. Eden it was emphasized that its content did not predecide England's position with respect to the other borders in East Europe<sup>28</sup>.

Something else that was very apparent was the lack of desire on the part of American diplomacy to recognize the western border of the USSR. The position of the Polish government in exile and its anti-Soviet aims met a sympathetic response among the reactionary circles of the United States and exerted an influence upon the formation of the position taken by the State Department in the question of the postwar borders in Europe<sup>29</sup>. No small role was also played by the fact that a number of Western state figures did not have confidence in the ability of the USSR not only to complete the war victoriously, but even to escape defeat within the near future. Hence there was a lack of readiness to conduct negotiations with the Soviet Union concerning the goals of the war or the postwar arrangement, or to take its interests and its point of view into consideration.

All the previously mentioned factors found expression in the Atlantic Charter -- a bilateral declaration by the United States and Great Britain, which represented, as Churchill noted, "a temporary and partial statement concerning the goals of the war, a statement that is intended to convince all the countries of our just goals, rather than being a completed scheme that we must carry out after the victory"<sup>30</sup>. The Atlantic Charter reflected the anti-fascist nature of the war and contained the formulation of a number of democratic and progressive principles for postwar settlement. The goal set was: the annihilation of Nazi tyranny; the restoration of the sovereign rights of the peoples who had been trampled upon by the usurpers; the recognition of the right of peoples to choose their own form of government; and a declaration was made concerning the just postwar arrangement of the peace<sup>31</sup>.

But even the Atlantic Charter had substantial shortcomings. While proclaiming the principle of respect for the sovereign rights of nations, those who drew up the charter specially stipulated, in the official commentaries to it, that that principle did not extend to colonial nations. In that charter, nothing was said about the need for the complete defeat of Hitlerite Germany. It also failed to point out the specific paths for eliminating the Nazi "New Order" in Europe and bypassed the question of how the "better future for the world"

after the war would be achieved<sup>32</sup>. Finally, one of the goals of American diplomacy during the creation of the Atlantic Charter was to "bind" England in the decision of the questions of postwar peace settlement.

The Atlantic Charter was developed without the participation of the USSR or any consultation with it. The circumstances of its appearance attested to the claims of the ruling circles of the United States and England to play the role of the deciders of the fates of other nations<sup>33</sup>. Certain of its hazy formulations and expressions contained in an extremely camouflaged form the possibility of interpreting them as a claim for the restoration of the situation that had existed before the war, a claim for the restoration of the political and social status quo.

At the Inter-Allies Conference in London that had convened in order to discuss the Atlantic Charter, the Soviet representative announced on 24 September 1941 a special Declaration by the USSR Government, which expressed agreement with its basic principles, but simultaneously contains a number of essential refinements and additions. The Soviet declaration provided a definition of the nature of the war and precisely formulated the main military goal -- the most rapid, most decisive defeat of the aggressor -- and proclaimed the important democratic principle of postwar peace settlement -- the right of nations to self-determination. Finally, it advanced the idea of collective security as one of the chief conditions for achieving a prolonged and solid peace<sup>34</sup>.

The Atlantic Charter and the Soviet declaration laid the foundation for the cooperation among the basic powers in the antifascist coalition with regard to problems of the postwar arrangement of the peace, and set down the initial program basis for their further actions<sup>35</sup>. However, the transition from the proclamation of general principles to the discussion of specific questions proved to be prolonged, difficult, and convoluted.

Those events gave a new impetus to developing plans for the postwar arrangement of Europe on the part of all the countries that were participating in the war against the fascist bloc. In late September 1941, in connection with the establish of relations between the USSR and the National Committee of Free France, the Soviet government announced its firm resolve, after victory over the enemy, "to guarantee the complete restoration of the independence and greatness of France"<sup>36</sup>.

Simultaneously, at the Inter-Allies Conference in London, a new joint Polish-Czechoslovakian declaration was announced. That declaration confirmed the intentions of the two governments in exile to create, after the war, a confederation of the two countries. The statement made by the Polish representative developed the plans for the creation of a "bloc of countries situated between the Baltic, Black, and Aegean seas" during the postwar period<sup>37</sup>. The intention was to make the Polish-Czechoslovakian confederation the nucleus of that bloc, with the role of its leader being given by the Polish emigre circles to themselves.

Actually standing here the plans for the creation of European federations and confederations was British diplomacy, which consciously brought out into the



foreground the Polish government in exile, a government that was actively developing the old plans for the restoration of a "cordon sanitaire" that had been inflated to extreme limits. Polish reactionary forces did not conceal the fact that the chief goal of their plans was the complete exclusion of the Soviet Union from the political life of Europe<sup>38</sup>.

In the summer and autumn of 1941 there appeared on the political scene in London the Yugoslavian and Greek royal governments in exile, which were immediately included in the development of all kinds of plans for the postwar arrangement of Europe and which merged their voices into the anti-Soviet chorus. Those governments and others evaluated the conducting in Moscow on 10-11 August 1941 of the First All-Slavic Meeting that called upon the Slavic nations to rise up in the struggle against the Hitlerism that represented a mortal danger for all of them, as the manifestation of the "pan-Slavic nature" of Soviet policy<sup>39</sup>.

Under British guardianship, the Yugoslavian and Greek governments began engaging in negotiations concerning the creation of a Balkan union that would become a component part of the reorganization of postwar Europe. Negotiations concerning the draft version of the Yugoslavian-Greek confederation as the basis of the future Balkan union were actually conducted in October and November 1941<sup>40</sup>. An agreement concerning the creation of the Yugoslavian-Greek confederation was achieved by the end of November 1941, but its signing was postponed in view of the impending visit of A. Eden to Moscow, where he intended to obtain from the Soviet government support for the British plans.

Simultaneously, on British initiative, the idea of creating a federation extending from the Baltic to the Aegean Sea was supported by representatives of the rightist social democrats of Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Greece at the international conference of social-democratic parties in London in November 1941. The same idea was supported by the representatives of the agrarian parties of Central and Southeast Europe who were located at that time in England in connection with the planned conference of the "Green International"<sup>41</sup>.

The discussion of the postwar arrangement of Europe began taking on the nature of the compilation of extensive schemes that included all the European regions. One of these projects was presented by E. Benes, who gave a lecture in England [sic], at the University of Aberdeen, on the topic "The Current War and the Future of Europe." The postwar organization of the continent seemed to him to have the form of a system of regional blocs (federations). He spoke vaguely about the postwar prospects for Western Europe. He linked Germany's future with its "decentralization" and with the elimination of Prussia's predominance over the other parts of Germany. He gave the Soviet Union only the role of participant in the "European equilibrium," but stated that he was against attempts to isolate it from Europe<sup>42</sup>. All of Benes' judgments were based on the so-called theory of "balance of powers."

The fact that E. Benes did not speak by using spontaneous improvisations, but, rather, drew his inspiration from British sources is attested to by the almost verbatim coincidence between his ideas and those expressed by Churchill concerning the desirability of dismembering Germany, about which Churchill had

first raised the question in a conversation with Soviet ambassador in London I. M. Mayskiy on 27 November, and then, on 5 December 1941, he refined that idea. In order to eliminate the German danger, the British prime minister assumed, "it is necessary to have the complete disarmament of Germany for at least a whole generation, the fractionation of Germany into parts, and primarily the separation of Prussia from the other parts of Germany... The Europe of the future appears to Churchill in approximately the same form: England, the USSR, France, Italy, etc. continue to exist as independent powers. The small states unite into federations (Balkan, Central European, Scandinavian, etc.). It is from this angle of vision that Churchill welcomes attempts to create the federation of Poland and Czechoslovakia." And what was supposed to rise above that entire European conglomeration, I. M. Mayskiy reported, was a kind of central agency, something like a "European council" that would keep an eye on order on the continent<sup>43</sup>.

All these facts attested that England and the other bourgeois participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition that had formed had begun to develop plans for the postwar arrangement of Europe, which were of an antidemocratic, and frequently also an anti-Soviet, nature. Soviet diplomacy could not ignore those tendencies, just as it could not fail to notice the attempts by British diplomacy to refuse to discuss with the USSR the postwar organization of the peace. I. V. Stalin drew attention to that in his 8 November 1941 message to Churchill<sup>44</sup>.

In a speech of 6 November 1941 on the occasion of the 24th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, I. V. Stalin emphasized that the USSR "does not have and cannot have such wartime goals as the seizure of other people's territories, the subjugation of other nations," "does not have and cannot have such wartime goals as the forcing of its will and its regime upon the Slavic and other enslaved nations of Europe which are expecting help from us." Our first goal, he noted in that speech, consisted in the liberation of the Soviet territories and peoples from the German-fascist yoke; the USSR would not commit any interference in the domestic affairs of other nations while rendering assistance to them in their liberation struggle against the Hitlerite tyranny<sup>45</sup>.

The problem of the postwar organization of the peace was touched upon in the correspondence between W. Churchill and I. V. Stalin in late November 1941 in connection with the preparation of A. Eden's visit to Moscow. "When the war is won, of which I am certain," Churchill stated in his letter of 22 November, "we hope that Soviet Russia, Great Britain, and the United States will meet at the victory conference table as the three chief participants and as those whose actions will destroy Nazism. Naturally, the first task will consist in preventing Germany, and especially Prussia, from attacking us a third time." Then Churchill remarked that the differences in the social system of the USSR and Britain were not an obstacle for drawing up a "good plan for guaranteeing our mutual security and our legal interests"<sup>46</sup>. In the message of reply, dated 23 November 1941, I. V. Stalin, welcoming the forthcoming visit of the British Foreign Minister, A. Eden, to Moscow, wrote, "It is completely correct that the discussion and acceptance of a plan for the postwar organization of the peace must proceed from the attempt to prevent Germany, and primarily Prussia, from violating the peace again and drawing nations again into bloody

carnage." He agreed that the differences in the nature of the state system should have no effect upon the favorable resolution of the "fundamental questions concerning the guaranteeing of our mutual security and legal interests," and expressed the hope that "if, in this area, there are any reservations or doubts, they will be dispelled as a result of the negotiations with Mr. Eden"<sup>47</sup>.

But A. Eden, departing for Moscow, did not have any intention of assuming any pledges<sup>48</sup>. Those purposes had an effect upon his attitude to the Soviet proposals, particularly to the draft plan for a treaty that planned the general outlines of the postwar arrangement of the peace. That draft "stipulated the restoration of Yugoslavia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Greece in their prewar boundaries, as well as the transferral to Poland of Eastern Prussia and the removal of the Rhineland from Prussia, and also recognized the 1941 boundary for the USSR"<sup>49</sup>. In the series of problems of the postwar settlement, the question that was of primary importance for Soviet diplomacy was the question of guaranteeing the security of the Soviet state, the international recognition of its state boundaries. However, in the course of Moscow negotiations in December 1941 the British minister declined to make a clear declaration concerning the recognition of the western boundary of the USSR that had existed at the time of the German attack on the Soviet Union, referring at such time to the Atlantic Charter<sup>50</sup>. Therefore A. Eden's visit to Moscow did not lead to the concluding either of a military treaty concerning an alliance and mutual assistance during wartime, or a political treaty governing postwar cooperation<sup>51</sup>. Nevertheless the problems that were raised in the course of the Moscow negotiations continued to be discussed over diplomatic channels, and the negotiations themselves helped to ascertain the British positions with regard to a number of questions.

A. Eden's visit to Moscow coincided in time with Anglo-American negotiations in Washington (the Arcadia Conference) with the participation of Churchill and Roosevelt. That meeting occurred in an atmosphere of the entry of the United States into the war after the attack by the Japanese fleet on Pearl Harbor. The establishment of the Anglo-American alliance within the confines of the antifascist coalition attached new aspects to the entire problem that was linked with the postwar arrangement of the peace. There was a sharp increase in the political ambitions of the British ruling circles, which were counting on relying on the American might in the achievement of their political goals both on the European continent and throughout the world.

The entry of the United States into the war contributed to the further consolidation of the anti-Hitlerite coalition which was expressed in the signing on 1 January 1942 in Washington of a common Declaration by 26 countries, which subsequently began to be called the "United Nations." That declaration, which had been drawn up the State Department on Roosevelt's initiative, and in the preliminary discussion of which the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, M. M. Litvinov, had participated on instructions from the Soviet government<sup>52</sup>, became a collective agreement governing collaboration among themselves by the countries that had signed it in their struggle against the fascist bloc and it contained a pledge not to conclude a separate peace or armistice with the enemy<sup>53</sup>. The declaration for the first time put into circulation the term "United Nations" for the purpose of officially



designating the participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition; the declaration concerning the annexation of the states that had signed it to the Atlantic Charter gave the principles in that charter the nature of international legal norms; the declaration reflected the Soviet position concerning the necessity of "complete victory over the enemy" as the military goal of the United Nations, as well as the pledge to use for the attainment of that goal "all our resources, military and economic." As a whole, the Declaration was of major importance not only for the purpose of organizing the cooperation among the democratic states in the struggle against the fascist bloc, but also for the postwar organization of the peace and international relations<sup>54</sup>.

The reinforcement of the international positions of the USSR, especially as a result of the victory of the Soviet troops outside Moscow, encouraged the ruling circles of Great Britain to take a number of steps that were supposed to create the prerequisites for implementing the British plans for the postwar reorganization of Europe. In London there began to be disseminated more and more loudly the anti-Soviet insinuations of the Polish reactionary emigre groups, as well as the conjectures of the Yugoslavian emigre politicians concerning the alleged Soviet intentions to subjugate the Balkans to themselves and to gain access to the Aegean and Mediterranean seas. The nature of the activity of British diplomacy found its reflection in a memorandum of 8 January 1942 by a responsible associate of the Foreign Office, P. Dixon, who had studied the Balkan problem area. In order to protect the Balkans from the "Soviet threat," Dixon wrote, it was necessary, first of all, the support the anti-Sovietism of the Yugoslavian and Greek governments in exile; secondly, to accelerate the signing of an agreement between Yugoslavia and Greece concerning the Balkan federation, which would become a "bastion both against German expansion and against Soviet expansion"; thirdly, at the concluding phase of the war, Southeast Europe should be occupied by one of the Allied armies, which would "erect a barrier between the advancing Russians and the defeating Germans"<sup>55</sup>. This memorandum not only drew for the first time the outlines of the future British plans for the "Balkan version," but also cynically revealed the anti-Soviet essence of the draft plans for various federations in Europe. On 15 January 1942 in London, at a solemn situation in the presence of A. Eden and the American ambassador, the Yugoslavian and Greek governments in exile signed a treaty governing a Balkan union. The agreement provided for the organization of common political, economic, and financial agencies in the countries that were united into the union, and their close military cooperation<sup>56</sup>. The absence of a Soviet representative<sup>57</sup> emphasized the negative attitude that Soviet diplomacy took to this private deal that was undertaken behind the back of the Balkan nations and that was attempting to predetermine their fate.

On 23 January 1942 an agreement governing a Polish-Czechoslovakian confederation was signed<sup>58</sup>. That agreement between the immediately neighbors of the USSR directly touched upon Soviet interests, especially since the reactionary Polish emigre groups in their propaganda had frankly revealed their great-power ambitions, their claims to the leading role in the future Central European federation and to leadership in determining its foreign policy, especially with respect to the Soviet Union<sup>59</sup>.

It was no secret to anyone that the actions of the emigre governments of the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe were backed up by British diplomacy and influential political circles in England and the United States. They deliberately ignored the tremendous sociopolitical shifts and revolutionary changes that were occurring everywhere in the countries that had been engulfed by the war.

Under those conditions the careful development of the Soviet program for the peace settlement in Europe and the postwar arrangement of the world was taking on greater and greater importance, and had become, in addition to the concern for the strengthening of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, one of the chief areas in the activity of Soviet diplomacy. In order to guarantee its implementation, on the decision of the Politburo of the VKP(b) Central Committee, in late January 1942 there was formed under the USSR NKID [People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs] a special Commission for Plans for the Postwar Arrangement of the Countries of Europe, Asia, and Other Parts of the World. The commission was headed by V. M. Molotov, and its members included Ye. S. Varga, A. Ya. Vyshinskiy, Ya. Z. Surits, K. A. Umanskiy, and others. Its task included the collection and studying of materials dealing with questions of the postwar arrangement, "including various schemes for intergovernmental federations, blocs, and unions that are advanced by foreign governments, political parties, and individual political figures"<sup>6780</sup>. The commission devoted the greatest amount of attention to the plans that directly touched upon the interests of the USSR.

The creation of the Commission for Studying the Plans for Postwar Arrangement under USSR NKID coincided with the formation of a similar service within the confines of the U.S. State Department -- a special "research group." Together with the "Consultative Commission for Postwar Problems," that had been created in January 1942 on orders from President Roosevelt, that group engaged in the study of the problems of the postwar arrangement of the peace, devoting the main attention to developing plans for the dismemberment of Germany<sup>61</sup>. The Foreign Office also engaged in similar questions, concentrating its attention on developing plans for European federations and confederations.

At the same time the British and American diplomatic services began to coordinate their plans and actions, with the first object of the exchange of opinions between them being the question of their negative attitude toward the recognition of the Soviet western border, that existed at the moment of the Hitlerite attack upon the USSR. Nothing new in this respect was introduced by V. M. Molotov's negotiations during a visit to England and the United States in May-June 1942<sup>62</sup>. Diplomatic acts that were concluded at that time -- the Soviet-English alliance treaty (26 May 1942) and the Soviet-American agreement governing the principles to be applied for reciprocal aid in conducting the war against aggression (11 June 1942) -- completed the formation of the anti-Hitlerite coalition. They firmly established for the first time the understanding concerning the need to continue and to develop the cooperation among the three powers during the postwar period. However, there was still a long path ahead in the matter of working out not only the overall strategy (the second front) and military goals, but also the plans for the peace settlement and the postwar arrangement.

Declining to discuss the questions of the postwar arrangement, the reactionary circles of the Western powers cynically discussed the premature nature of the contacts dealing with political problems, inasmuch as the summer offensive of the Germans on the Soviet-German front was impending. How would it end? Would the Soviet Armed Forces withstand a new enemy onslaught? Therefore there was no sense in hurrying. Nor was anything changed in this regard by Churchill's visit to Moscow in August 1942, when strategic questions were discussed<sup>63</sup>.

At the same time the British ruling circles were continuing to develop their plans for the postwar arrangement. Something that is very telling in this regard was a 21 October 1942 memorandum from Churchill, addressed to Eden, that had been drawn up with regard to the proposals of the Foreign Office that had been coordinated with the State Department in Washington, concerning a "postwar world government." Expressing, in connection with this proposal, fears concerning American plans to cramp England on the world scene, and in particular to take into U.S. hands England's overseas imperial possessions, Churchill felt that the chief "threat" should be seen in Russia. What would Russia be like by the end of the war? And then he gave his judgments concerning the need to consolidate the "European family" on an anti-Soviet basis<sup>64</sup>.

Meanwhile the development of the Soviet program for the postwar arrangement of the peace and the guaranteeing of security in Europe was continuing. Soviet diplomacy was looking for points of contact in the resolution of the postwar problems and the plans of the other Allied powers, and was gradually working out resolutions for individual problems that had been coordinated with them. For example, a communique concerning A. Eden's visit to Moscow in 1941 recorded the overall view of the necessity, after the defeat of Germany, to take coordinated "steps that would make the repetition of German aggression in the future completely impossible." In the course of the negotiations in December 1941 with the premier of the Polish government in exile, General V. Sikorsky in Moscow, recognition was successfully achieved for the Soviet point of view concerning the nature of a future international organization to guarantee universal peace<sup>65</sup>. This was the first statement on this question by a leading power in the anti-Hitlerite coalition. The USSR became consolidated with the participants of the conference of Allied countries that had been occupied by Germany, at which, on 13 January 1942, they adopted a Declaration that proclaimed as one of the goals of the war the punishment of the Hitlerites and their accomplices for the crimes that they had committed in the occupied countries. Somewhat later (October 1942) in a special statement by the Soviet government, the proposal was made to turn over the Nazi criminals to a special military tribunal<sup>66</sup>. Finally, Soviet diplomacy took cognizance of the fact of the conclusion in August 1942 of a Czechoslovakian-British agreement concerning the question of the cessation of the Munich Treaty and all its consequences<sup>67</sup>.

With regard to a number of questions Soviet diplomacy made statements that explained the Soviet position. For example, the Soviet Union sharply separated itself from the plans to dismember Germany which had begun to be developed by the Western powers<sup>68</sup>. The 23 February 1942 order of the USSR



people's commissar of defense remarked, "The experience of the war teaches us that Hitlers come and go, but the German nation, the German state, remains"<sup>69</sup>.

In December 1942 the USSR came out in favor of restoring the independence of Albania<sup>70</sup>. The Soviet statement was published simultaneously with corresponding statements by England the United States, which had been preceded by consultative sessions along the diplomatic channels. The British statement was made in a form that left open the possibility of the subsequent annexation of Albania to the Balkan confederation that was being planned in London<sup>71</sup>.

The USSR perceived with a sense of satisfaction the decision made by the United States and England at a conference in Casablanca to strive for the "unconditional capitulation" of the Axis countries. That principle coincided entirely with the Soviet aim at the complete defeat of the fascist states as the chief goal of the anti-Hitlerite coalition<sup>72</sup>.

The Anglo-American contacts that began in the summer of 1942 to deal with problems of the postwar arrangement revealed the existence in those countries of common plans for establishing the world hegemony of the two Anglo-Saxon powers. Simultaneously, discrepancies that existed between them in the distribution of their roles also floated to the surface. American diplomacy suspected the British of wanting to use the American forces and influence not only for the purpose of restoring the British colonial empire, but also for the purpose of expanding their possessions in Asia and Africa. However, the United States had no intention of pulling chestnuts out of the fire for the British empire. The U.S. views concerning the postwar arrangement proceeded from an evaluation of the fact that, during the course of the war, the United States would become a very strong world power in the military and economic sense and would retain its positions during the postwar years. Taking into consideration the importance of Europe in world affairs, the United States did not share the British plans for European federations that were aimed at the establishment of British hegemony in Europe. But the American ruling circles did not deem it to be desirable to announce their plans prematurely, and they were waiting until the changes in the military-strategic situation in the course of the war would make it possible for American predominance over the other participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition to manifest itself clearly.

That major turning point in the war actually came. However, it occurred in a different form from what the strategists in Washington had imagined. The major turning point in the course of the war was caused by the historic victories of the Soviet Army at Stalingrad and at the Kursk-Orel Salient in 1943, which opened up the prospects for the victorious completion of the war. The Soviet Union not only bore the basic weight of the war against Hitlerite Germany and its satellites, but also was continuing to build up its military potential to such a degree that the ruling circles of the Western power began to understand that the USSR was capable, by exerting its own efforts, not only to liberate its own territory, but also to inflict a crushing defeat on the enemy.

The major turning point in the course of the war was accompanied by a fundamental change in the entire system of international relations. It was influenced by the tremendous growth of the international authority of the

USSR, by the intensification of its role in the resolution of world problems. The ruling circles of the Western powers made their own conclusions from this: at the Anglo-American conference in March 1943 in Washington with the participation of Roosevelt and Eden, where there was a discussion of many political problems, including the recognition of the western boundary of the Soviet Union<sup>73</sup>, Roosevelt expressed the idea of using the question of its recognition as an instrument for exerting pressure upon the USSR with regard to other questions. Simultaneously the United States and England began paying more attention to questions of their postwar cooperation, their common policy with respect to the USSR, and the working out of joint positions with respect to Germany and the other European states, and with regard to colonial and Far East problems. Subsequently those questions were discussed during the meetings between Roosevelt and Churchill in May 1943 in Washington ("Trident") and in Quebec in August 1943 ("Quadrant"). At those meetings, as well as along diplomatic channels, the joint program of the postwar settlement and arrangement of the peace was actively developed. But inasmuch as the USSR was not included in the discussion of those problems, that activity was of a separate, and frequently anti-Soviet, nature, was aimed at the establishment of the dominant positions of the United States and England in the postwar world, and was subordinated to imperialistic considerations<sup>74</sup>.

A question that kept coming up with increasing frequency on the agenda of the foreign policy of the leading powers in the anti-Hitlerite coalition was the question of the attitude toward the Resistance movement that had spread considerably over the European countries that had been occupied by the fascists. The peculiarity of that problem lay in the fact that the liberation struggle of nations against the fascist yoke was accompanied by profound sociopolitical changes. An active role in it was played by the Communists and, in a number of countries, primarily the countries of Southeast Europe, the liberation movements were headed by the Communist and workers' parties. The programs that were worked out by them combined plans for the mass development of the national-liberation antifascist struggle with the implementation of fundamental sociopolitical reforms, and they included within themselves the requirements to create a new state and social structure and to change the previous foreign-policy course and orientation toward the USSR for the purpose of creating conditions that would preclude the possibility of a repetition of the German imperialistic aggression against them. While a component part of the forces that were fighting on the side of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, the liberation movements, however, encountered a hostile attitude toward themselves on the part of the Western powers, which opposed to them the bourgeois governments in exile (in Yugoslavia, Greece, Poland, and Czechoslovakia) and attempted to prevent the possibility of carrying out their political program, and to prevent new political forces from coming into power after the liberation of those countries. This revealed the class nature of the policy of the Western powers, which were pursuing the goal of restoring the internal orders in a number of European countries. They denied the right of nations to choose the path for their sociopolitical development, that is, the right to decide independently the questions of their own internal arrangement, which right was proclaimed as one of the principles of the policy of the countries in the anti-Hitlerite coalition and one of the principles of the postwar arrangement.

Unlike the Western powers, the Soviet Union came out consistently in support of the Resistance movements, in favor of the recognition of their place in the ranks of the anti-Hitlerite coalition and their right to political representation. The Soviet Union unified with the Resistance movements the profound coincidence of interests both in the struggle against fascism and in the understanding of the tasks of the peace settlement and postwar security. That coincidence of interests consolidated them and turned the USSR into a leader of those forces that were in favor of intensifying the liberation, antifascist nature of the war and who simultaneously were striving, within the limits of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, to stop the imperialistic tendencies in the policy of the Western powers.

A question that was of fundamental importance for the postwar arrangement of the peace and the creation of a system of security was the question of the agreements dealing with postwar problems among the leading powers and the other countries that were allies in the anti-Hitlerite coalition. This question arose for the first time in June 1942 in connection with the idea of concluding a Soviet-Yugoslavian agreement. At that time the British government proposed coming to an understanding that the USSR and Great Britain would not conclude with the governments in exile of the occupied European countries any treaties dealing with postwar problems without preliminary joint consultation and coordination<sup>75</sup>. Making no objection to this agreement, the Soviet government expressed the desire to receive from the government of Great Britain concrete proposals in that regard. But those proposals were not forthcoming, and the matter was limited to a preliminary exchange of opinions.

That question took on vital importance again in connection with the negotiations that began in the spring of 1943, concerning the conclusion of a Soviet-Czechoslovakian treaty of friendship, reciprocal aid, and postwar cooperation. In the summer of 1943 London expressed objections to that treaty, by making a statement to the president of Czechoslovakia, E. Benes, concerning the existence of an agreement between Great Britain and the USSR that allegedly bound them not to conclude, prior to the end of the war, any treaties dealing with postwar problems with European countries whose territory had been occupied by the Hitlerites. After receiving information from Benes, the USSR government directed the attention of the British government to the lack of such an agreement. In reply the British side in August 1943 renewed its proposal concerning the agreement, but whereas previously it had been a matter of not concluding treaties dealing with postwar problems without preliminary consultation, the situation that now prevailed was the taking of a pledge to refrain entirely from the concluding of such treaties<sup>76</sup>. It was obvious that England was attempting to create obstacles for the development of Soviet relations with the countries of Central and Southeast Europe, to hamper the efforts of Soviet diplomacy to lay the foundations of postwar security, and to create the prerequisites for pushing through the British plans for the postwar arrangement of Europe.

The major turning point in the war and the new tasks of Soviet diplomacy that were linked with the close prospects for the defeat of the fascist bloc made increasingly persistent the need for the specific working out of a program for the postwar arrangement of the peace. Diplomatic practice itself began gradually to move toward taking that step. For example, in the spring of 1943



E. Benes, preparing for an official visit to the United States, requested the Soviet ambassador assigned to the Allied governments in London, A. Ye. Bogomolov, to communicate to him the point of view of the Soviet government concerning the basic factors in the postwar arrangement of Europe, so that he could take into consideration the Soviet views when discussing in Washington the problems that were linked with Central and Southeast Europe<sup>77</sup>. That information was provided to him.

Another factor that exerted an influence upon the working out of the plans for the postwar arrangement was the unusual crisis with regard to the confidence among the basic participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition as a result of the decision by the United States and England to refuse even in 1943 to open up a second front in Europe. In the Soviet Union this refusal made a negative impression, especially since the Allies, when making that decision, did not even attempt to discuss this very important question with the USSR<sup>78</sup>. The Soviet government recalled the Soviet ambassadors from London (I. M. Mayskiy) and Washington (M. M. Litvinov) in late June 1943 "for consultations"<sup>79</sup>. However, that formula was augmented by a clarification that the ambassadors were supposed to arrive in Moscow "to participate in a discussion of postwar problems"<sup>80</sup>.

The collapse of the fascist bloc that had begun and the approaching of the course of events to the point where the agenda would include the questions of concluding armistices and peace treaties with the vanquished countries made vitally important the problems that were linked with the postwar arrangement of the peace, and required new organizational measures and the creations of subdivisions that specially engaged in those questions. For that purpose in early September 1943, in accordance with a decision by the Politburo of the VKP(b), the Commission on Questions of Peace Treaties and Postwar Arrangement was created under USSR NKID. That commission was headed by M. M. Litvinov and also included O. V. Kuusinen, S. A. Lozovskiy, D. Z. Manuil'skiy, Ya. Z. Surits, Ye. V. Tarle, B. Ye. Shteyn, and others. Simultaneously the Commission on Questions of Armistice was formed. That commission was headed by K. Ye. Voroshilov, and its members also included M. R. Galaktionov, A. A. Ignat'yev, I. M. Mayskiy, V. P. Potemkin, B. M. Shaposhnikov, and others<sup>81</sup>.

Simultaneously the Soviet Union raised before the Western powers the question of the inadmissibility in the future of their separate actions with regard to problems of peace settlement and postwar arrangement. That question arose in connection with Italy's departure from the war. In a message of 22 August 1943 from I. V. Stalin to Roosevelt and Churchill, it was indicated: "Until the present time the situation has been such that the United States and England have been reaching understandings, and the USSR has received information about the results of those understandings between the two powers as a third, passive observer. I must tell you that this situation cannot be tolerated any more." The message made the proposal "to create a military-political commission made up of representatives of the three countries -- the United States, Great Britain, and the USSR -- for the purpose of considering the questions of negotiations with various governments that are falling away from Germany." The Soviet side considered the creation of that commission to be an urgent question<sup>82</sup>.

The necessity that had arisen to coordinate a broad number of political and military problems among the three basic participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition rose to full height in the autumn of 1943, when the idea of a summit meeting of the "Big Three" was advanced. In the course of the preparation for that meeting, it was deemed to be desirable to carry out a preliminary meeting of the foreign ministers of the United States, Great Britain, and the USSR. The problems that were to be discussed included the questions of the peace settlement and the postwar arrangement of Europe.

The British government developed particularly intensive activity, constructing plans for various associations (federations and confederations) of the countries of Central and Southeast Europe which had as their intention the restoration in that region of the prewar sociopolitical orders and the guaranteeing of the dominant influence of Great Britain. The American side placed on the agenda for the Moscow conference the item "The future of Poland and the Danube and Balkan countries, including the question of confederations," and proposed a draft of a declaration by the three governments in favor of the unification of European states. The discussion of the problem of federations was also linked by London with the future of Austria and a question that had been put on the agenda by the British -- "the question of the joint responsibility for Europe in opposition to the question concerning individual regions of responsibility" by the basic participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition<sup>83</sup>.

At the Moscow conference the U.S. delegation supported the principle of joint responsibility for Europe, but came out against the British proposal concerning individual regions of responsibility. But in the question of federations it took an evasive position<sup>84</sup>.

The Soviet delegation remarked that the USSR government had never been in favor of individual regions of influence in Europe. Simultaneously the Soviet delegation made a statement in which the plans for federations were rejected as being premature and artificial, and it was indicated that they recalled the policy of the "cordon sanitaire" that had been directed against the USSR, and therefore it was a policy that was perceived by the Soviet nation negatively. In the final protocol of the conference it was recorded that the statement of the Soviet delegation had been "taken into cognizance"<sup>85</sup>. The British plans suffered complete defeat. That question was never raised again in relations among the Allies. The Declaration concerning Austria that was adopted at the conference did not touch upon the problem of federations in any way, but recorded the desire of the basic participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition "to a free and independent Austria established," and to have the "Anschluss" of the country by Hitlerite Germany in March 1938 declared to be "nonexistent and invalid"<sup>86</sup>.

For the joint resolution of the problems linked with the conclusion of the military actions and with the postwar settlement in Europe, particularly for the working out of the conditions for capitulation by Germany's satellites, the European Consultative Commission was created. On the initiative of the Soviet delegation, a "Declaration on Italy" was adopted, in which fundamental questions were raised concerning the elimination of the remnants of fascism and the democratization of the country's social life, and the Consultative

Council on Questions of Italy was formed<sup>87</sup>. A factor of substantial importance was the counteraction of the Soviet delegation to the attempts of the Western powers to ignore the political rights of the French Committee of National Liberation. Subsequently that was of fundamental importance for the struggle being waged by Soviet diplomacy for international recognition of the Antifascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia and the People's Regional Council in Poland.

There was serious discussion of the British proposal that the basic members of the anti-Hitlerite coalition do not conclude agreements with the small Allies on postwar questions. It was aimed at preventing the development of relations as allies between the USSR and the countries of Central and Southeast Europe. The consideration of that question at the conference converted it from a bilateral Anglo-Soviet question to a trilateral one. True, the United States, for tactical reasons, declined to discuss it. The Soviet side rejected the British proposal and emphasized the right both of the USSR and of Great Britain "for purposes of preserving the peace and resisting aggression, to conclude agreements dealing with postwar questions with neighboring allied states, without making that dependent upon consultations or coordination between them, inasmuch as such agreements pertain to questions of the direct security of their borders and the corresponding states that are bordering them, such as, for example, the USSR and Czechoslovakia." The British delegation refused to continue the discussion and took into cognizance the Soviet point of view. In the course of the conference, the British side had to remove its objections to the conclusion of the Soviet-Czechoslovakian treaty, and that fact was recorded in the final protocol of the conference<sup>88</sup>.

Finally, the Declaration dealing with the question of universal security jointly proclaimed the principle of unconditional capitulation as the goal of the war being waged by the anti-Hitlerite coalition against the Axis powers, recorded the striving of the sides to continue their postwar cooperation, and also recognized the necessity for the establishment of an international organization for purposes of maintaining the peace and security<sup>89</sup>.

The decisions of the Moscow conference of the ministers of foreign affairs of the USSR, the United States, and Great Britain were a major victory for the principles of Soviet foreign policy, and a large success achieved by Soviet diplomacy in defending the Soviet program of postwar arrangement.

The achievement of coordinated decisions with regard to questions representing the greatest interest to the USSR with the basic allies in the anti-Hitlerite coalition enabled the Soviet government to come forward with a well-developed program for postwar arrangement and security that was planned for a prolonged period of time. That program was proclaimed several days after the completion of the Moscow Conference in the 6 November 1943 report by the Chairman of the State Defense Committee which was devoted to the 26th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The forthcoming victory of the Allies over Hitlerite Germany, it was stated in that report, "will place on the agenda important questions in the organization and restoration of states and the economic and cultural life of European nations. Our government's policy in these questions remains unchanged. Together with our allies we shall have to:



1) liberate the nations of Europe from the fascist usurpers and render assistance to them in restoring their national states, which have been dismembered by the fascist enslavers -- the nations of France, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Greece, and other states located under the German yoke must become free and independent again;

2) grant to the liberated nations of Europe the complete right and freedom to decide for themselves the question of their state arrangement;

3) take steps to assure that all the fascist criminals who have been guilty of the present war and sufferings of nations, in whatever country they may be hiding, are given stern punishment and vengeance for all the vicious deeds perpetrated by them;

4) establish a procedure in Europe which would completely preclude the possibility of new aggression on the part of Germany;

5) create the prolonged economic, political, and cultural cooperation among the nations of Europe, a cooperation that is based on mutual trust and mutual aid for purposes of restoring the economy and culture that have been destroyed by the Germans"<sup>90</sup>.

Concealed behind the brief formulations in this program is a tremendous amount of work that was done by Soviet diplomacy to work out a coordination with the basic participants of the anti-Hitlerite coalition -- a coordination of the goals of the war and the principles of the postwar settlement and democratic arrangement of the peace. However, even greater efforts were still need to assure the real implementation of the planned program, to carry it out under the exceptionally complicated conditions of the final period of the war and during the postwar years.

Lying at the basis of the Soviet program for the postwar arrangement and security were the principles of Soviet foreign policy that have imbued the foreign-policy activity of the Soviet state throughout its entire existence: the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different socioeconomic systems and the principle of proletarian solidarity with all the progressive and national-liberation movements, with the just struggle being waged by nations for their social rights and national equality, and for their better future. "The program for postwar arrangement that was worked out by the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party was opposed to the imperialistic plans for Anglo-American dominance in the postwar world"<sup>91</sup>.

The Soviet program for postwar arrangement and security consisted of a number of elements which were a continuation of the line of the struggle waged by Soviet diplomacy for the creation of a system of collective security in Europe, a line that had been conducted since before the beginning of World War II. Retaining its succession, the Soviet program became enriched by taking into consideration the previous experience, that included an analysis of the reasons for the failure to create a system of collective security that was capable of preventing the unleashing of fascist aggression. It was based on a sober evaluation of the prospects for postwar settlement and attempted to pa

preserve the relations of allies with the participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition which had been achieved during the war.

A study of the official documents and statements of the Soviet government makes it possible to isolate at least three major problems that are interrelated with one another, which formed the basis of the Soviet program for postwar arrangement and security: first, the settlement of the German question in such a way that in the future Germany would not present any threat to the existence of neighboring states or the security of the USSR. The basis of that resolution must be not vengeance against a conquered enemy, but the elimination of Nazism and German militarism, and the subsequent democratization of Germany's social life. Secondly, the preservation of the cooperation among the participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition, primarily its "Big Three," and the creation on that basis of an international organization for security and an atmosphere of mutual trust, broad and prolonged cooperation in the economic, political, and cultural areas. Thirdly, the creation of a system of collective security in Europe by concluding alliances with the states that had been subjected to Hitlerite aggression, with the purpose of guaranteeing their interests and security.

The Soviet program for the postwar arrangement of the peace and security in Europe reflected both the overall goals of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, that were understood and interpreted from broad democratic positions, and the interests of the security of the Soviet Union. Together they created a firm foundation for cooperation between the USSR and other countries. There was an especially broad and profound coincidence between the interests of the Soviet Union and the national interests of the nations of Central and Southeast Europe and the sociopolitical goals of their progressive and democratic forces. That opened up the prospect for the further fruitful cooperation which, under the conditions of the war, fused into all kinds of assistance and support on the part of the USSR to the nations of Central and Southeast Europe, and to the liberation of them from the fascist yoke.

The most brilliant moments in the implementation of the principles of the Soviet program of postwar settlement were the conferences of the leaders of the three great powers -- the USSR, the United States, and Great Britain -- in Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. At those conferences, in the activity of the European Consultative Commission, and in the approach to the problems of individual states and the European continent as a whole, during the period of the negotiations concerning the Organization of United Nations [the United Nations], Soviet diplomacy defended the principles contained in the program and strove to achieve mutually acceptable agreements with its allies. The actions of Soviet diplomacy rested upon the growing might of the USSR and its decisive role in the struggle against the fascist bloc, and upon the liberating mission of the Soviet Armed Forces.

The coordinated decisions achieved by the leading powers of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, especially the decisions of the conferences at Yalta and Potsdam, became the brilliant testimony to the opportunity for fruitful cooperation among states with different sociopolitical systems in settling the most complicated world problems. The Yalta and Potsdam agreements created a basis in international law on which the political realities of the postwar era

formed. They recorded the situation that had actually developed by the end of the war and contained an understanding concerning the resolution of very important problems of postwar peace settlement or the coordinated principles for their resolution in the future. Despite the increased activity in the imperialistic tendencies in the policy of the Western powers and the anti-Soviet moods in the reactionary political circles of all the capitalist states, which reached their zenith during the years of the Cold War, the positive results of World War II could not be canceled out. The most important of those positive results were the formation of the worldwide socialist system, the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, and the beginning of a new stage in the overall crisis of capitalism. It is precisely these sociopolitical shifts that determined the fundamental change in the correlation of forces in the world, made it irreversible, and made it possible in the final analysis to draw the final line under World War II and to complete the postwar peace settlement at the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in August 1975. In that process, which took long years at the fault of the imperialistic powers, a prominent place was occupied by the Soviet program for the postwar arrangement of the peace and security in Europe, the foundations of which were laid in 1941-1943.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. "Istoriya vneshney politiki SSSR. 1917-1980." [History of USSR Foreign Policy. 1917-1980], Vol 1, 1917-1945. Under the editorship of A. A. Gromyko, B. N. Ponamarev. 4th ed., Moscow, 1980; "Istoriya Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza" [History of the CPSU], Vol 5, book 1, Moscow, 1970; "Istoriya diplomatii" [History of Diplomacy], Vol IV, Moscow, 1976; "Istoriya Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny Sovetskogo Soyuza, 1941-1945" [History of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, 1941-1945], Vol 2-3, Moscow, 1961; "Istoriya vtoroy mirovoy voyny, 1939-1945" [History of World War II, 1939-1945], Vol 4-7, Moscow, 1975-1976.

2. Israelyan, V. L., "Antigitlerovskaya koalitsiya (Diplomaticheskoye sotrudnichestvo SSSR, SShA i Anglii v gody vtoroy mirovoy voyny)" [The Anti-Hitlerite Coalition (The Diplomatic Cooperation Among the USSR, the United States, and England During World War II)], Moscow, 1964; Trukhanovskiy, V. G., "Vneshnyaya politika Anglii v period vtoroy mirovoy voyny (1939-1945)" [England's Foreign Policy During the Period of World War II], Moscow, 1965; etc.

3. Mayskiy, I. M., "Vospominaniya sovetskogo posla. Voyna. 1939-1943" [Recollections of a Soviet Ambassador. War. 1939-1943], Moscow, 1965; Berezhkov, V. M., "Rozhdeniye koalitsii" [Birth of a Coalition], Moscow, 1975.

4. Reference to a bibliography confirms this. For example, in the book "SSSR v gody Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny (iyun' 1941 - sentyabr' 1945 g.). Ukazatel' sovetskoy literatury za 1941-1967 gg." [USSR During the Years of the Great Patriotic War (June 1941 - September 1945). Index of Soviet Literature for 1941-1967] (Moscow, 1977), in the paragraph "USSR and Questions of the Postwar Arrangement of the Peace" (pp 652-653), there is mention of 18 works that were devoted chiefly to the struggle waged by Soviet diplomacy to carry out the Soviet program at the final stage of the war. However, among them



there is not a single research work concerning the process of development or genesis of that program.

5. Among the most important research works dealing with these problems, one should mention: McNeill, W. H., "America, Britain and Russia. Their Co-operation and Conflict, 1941-1946," London, 1953; Feis, H., "Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin. The War They Waged and the Peace They Sought," Princeton, 1957.

6. Mastny, V., "Soviet War Aims at the Moscow and Teheran Conferences of 1943," THE JOURNAL OF MODERN HISTORY, Chicago, Vol 47, No 3, 1975.

7. See: Rothwell, V., "Britain and the Cold War, 1941-1947," London, 1982.

8. Vorontsov, G. F., "Voyennyye koalitsii i koalitsionnyye voyny" [Military Coalitions and Coalition Wars], Moscow, 1976, pp 109-110.

9. "Vneshnyaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuza v period Otechestvennoy voyny. Dokumenty i materialy" [Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union During the Period of the Great Patriotic War. Documents and Materials], Vol I (22 June 1941 - 31 December 1943), Moscow, 1946, p 34.

10. "Sovetsko-angliyskiye otnosheniya vo vremya Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny 1941-1945. Dokumenty i materialy v dvukh tomakh" [Soviet-British Relations During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945. Documents and Materials in Two Volumes], Vol 1, Moscow, 1983, document No 15, pp 69-73; "Istoriya vtoroy mirovoy voyny. 1939-1945", Vol 4, 1975, p 165.

11. "Dokumenty i materialy po istorii sovetsko-pol'skikh otnosheniy" [Documents and Materials on the History of Soviet-Polish Relations], Vol XII, 1939-1943, Moscow, 1973, document No 127, pp 198-199.

12. "Vneshnyaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuza...", Vol I, pp 130-132, 143.

13. "Istoriya vtoroy mirovoy voyny. 1939-1945", Vol 4, p 167.

14. Woodward, L., "British Foreign Policy in the Second World War," Vol 1, London, 1970, p 284.

15. Ibid., pp 284-286.

16. Ibid., p 288.

17. "Dokumenty z historie ceskoslovenske politiky 1939-1943," sv. 1, Prague, 1966, document No 20, p 50; document No 27, p 57; document No 31, pp 59-60.

18. Ibid., document No 46, pp 70-73.
19. "Dokumenty i materialy po istorii sovetsko-chekhoslovatskikh otnosheniy" [Documents and Materials on the History of Soviet-Czechoslovakian Relations], Vol 4, book 1. March 1939 - December 1943, Moscow, 1981, document No 64, pp 102-103; Benes, E., "Sest let exilu a druhe svetove valky Reci, projevy a dokumenty z r. 1938-1945," Prague, 1946, pp 455-456.
20. Lashtoviehka, B., "V Londone vo vremya voyny" [In London in Wartime], Moscow, 1966, pp 58-62.
21. Raczynski, E., "In Allied London," London, 1962, p 101.
22. "Dokumenty i materialy po istorii sovetsko-chekhoslovatskikh otnosheniy", Vol 4, book 1, document No 67, pp 105-106; Pozdeyeva, L. V., "Anglo-amerikanskiye otnosheniya v gody vtoroy mirovoy voyny. 1939-1941" [Anglo-American Relations During World War II. 1939-1941], Moscow, 1964, pp 268-272.
23. "War and Peace Aims of the United Nations," ed. by L. Holborn, Boston, 1943, p 40.
24. Pozdeyeva, L. V., op. cit., pp 249-250.
25. "War and Peace Aims...", pp 202-206.
26. Raczynski, E., op. cit., p 93; "War and Peace Aims...", p 3.
27. "Sovetsko-chekhoslovatskiye otnosheniya vo vremya Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny 1941-1945 gg. Dokumenty i materialy" [Soviet-Czechoslovakian Relations During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945. Documents and Materials], Moscow, 1960, p 14.
28. Parsadanova, V. S., "Sovetsko-pol'skiye otnosheniya v gody Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny 1941-1945" [Soviet-Polish Relations During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945], Moscow, 1982; Kowalski, W., "Walka dyplomatyczna o miejsce Polski w Europe (1939-1945), w. 5, Warsaw, 1979, pp 215-216.
29. "Foreign Relations of the United States (here under FRUS). Diplomatic Papers, 1941," Vol 1, Washington, 1958, pp 247-248.
30. See: "Istoriya diplomatii" [History of Diplomacy], Vol IV, p 208.
31. For text of the Atlantic Charter, see: "Vneshnyaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuz...", Vol I, p 167.
32. Israelyan, V. L., op. cit., pp 64-71; Vorontsov, G. F., op. cit., pp 109-110.
33. "Sovetsko-angliyskiye otnosheniya...", Vol 1, document No 34, p 104; document No 35, p 108.
34. "Vneshnyaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuz...", Vol I, pp 163-166.

35. Boratynskiy, S., "Diplomatiya perioda vtoroy mirovoy voyny" [Diplomacy of the Period of World War II], Moscow, 1959, pp 77-131.
36. "Sovetsko-frantsuzskiye otnosheniya vo vremya Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny 1941-1945. Dokumenty i materialy v dvukh tomakh" [Soviet-French Relations During World War II, 1941-1945. Documents and Materials in Two Volumes]. Vol 1, Moscow, 1983, document No 12, pp 51-52.
37. "War and Peace Aims...", pp 464-465.
38. Kowalsky, W., op. cit., p 203.
39. Djuretic, V., "Vlada na bespuću. -- Internationalizacija jugoslavenakih protivorečnosti na politickoj pozornici drugog svetskog rata." Belgrade, 1982, pp 106-108.
40. Djuretic, V., op. cit., pp 112-114.
41. Lashtovichka, B., op. cit., p 69.
42. Benes, E., "Towards a Lasting Peace," London, 1942, pp 3-18.
43. "Sovetsko-angliyskiye otnosheniya...", Vol 1, document No 73, p 182; "Istoriya vneshney politiki SSSR. 1917-1980", Vol 443.
44. "Perepiska Predsedatelya Soveta Ministrov SSSR s Prezidentami SShA i Prem'yer-ministrami Velikobritanii vo vremya Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny 1941-1945 gg." [Correspondence of the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers with the Presidents of the United States and the Prime Ministers During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945], Vol I, Moscow, 1957, p 31.
45. "Vneshnyaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuza...", Vol I, p 49.
46. "Perepiska...", Vol I, p 33.
47. Ibid., p 34.
48. Feis, H., op. cit., pp 24-25.
49. Mayskiy, I. M., op. cit., p 207; see also: "FRUS. Diplomatic Papers, 1941," Vol III, Washington, 1961, pp 495-503.
50. "Sovetsko-angliyskiye otnosheniya...", Vol 1, document No 75, pp 184-187; document No 76, pp 188-192; document No 77, pp 192-198.
51. "Istoriya diplomatii", Vol IV, pp 219-220.
52. Trukhanovskiy, V. G., op. cit., p 285.
53. "Vneshnyaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuza...", Vol I, p 194.



54. International-legal analysis of the Declaration of the United Nations, see: Boratynskiy, S., op. cit., pp 132-168.
55. Djuretic, V., op. cit., p 118.
56. "War and Peace Aims...", pp 535-538.
57. Djuretic, V., op.cit., p 120.
58. Lashtovichka, B., op. cit., pp 65-67.
59. Ibid., p 70.
60. "Istoriya Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuz", Vol 5, book 1, p 550.
61. "Istoriya vneshney politiki SSSR. 1917-1980", Vol 1, p 443.
62. "Sovetsko-angliyskiye soglasheniya...", document No 100, pp 221-223; document 112, pp 244-247; Note 32, p 518; Note 39, p 519.
63. Ibid., document No 130, pp 265-271; document No 131, pp 271-276; document No 134, pp 279-283; Feis, H., op. cit., pp 74-80.
64. Churchill, W., "The Second World War," Vol IV, London, 1951, p 504.
65. "Vneshnyaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuz...", Vol I, pp 191-192, 193.
66. Ibid., pp 314-320, 561.
67. "Sovetsko-chechoslovatskiye otnosheniya...", document No 28, p 55.
68. For information concerning the plans being constructed in the United States and England, see: Mel'nikov, D. Ye., "Plans for Dismembering Germany (1941-1945)," MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN', No 6, 1959, pp 78-87.
69. "Vneshnyaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuz...", Vol I, p 58.
70. Djuretic, V., "Britanske ratne vizije albanske budunosti," VOJNOISTORIJSKI GLASNIK, Belgrade, No 2, 1978, pp 87-93.
72. "Istoriya vtoroy mirovoy voyny. 1939-1945", Vol 6, p 401.
73. Feis, H., op. cit., pp 122-124; "FRUS. Diplomatic Papers, 1943," Vol III, p 14.
74. "Istoriya mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy i vneshney politiki", Vol II, 1939-1945. Moscow, 1967, pp 164-166.
75. "Sovetsko-angliyskiye otnosheniya...", Vol 1, document No 127, pp 261-262.
76. Ibid., document No 237, pp 408-409; document No 249, pp 422-425; document No 259, pp 442-444.

77. Benes, E., "Memoirs. From Munich to New War and New Victory," Boston, 1954, pp 184-185.

78. "Perepiska...", Vol I, pp 130-131, 135-138; Vol II, pp 69-70.

79. Mayskiy, I. M., op. cit., p 343.

80. Ibid.

81. "Sovetskiy Soyuz na mezhdunarodnykh konferentsiyakh perioda Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny 1941-1945 gg. Sbornik dokumentov, t. 1. Moskovskaya konferentsiya ministrov inostrannykh del SSSR, SShA i Velikobritanii (19-30 oktyabrya 1943)" [The Soviet Union at International Conferences During the Period of the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945. Collection of documents, Vol 1. Moscow Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, the United States, and Great Britain (19-30 October 1943)], Moscow, 1978, pp 18-19. See also: Yunin, M. M., "Dumbarton Oaks Conference (From the History of the Creation of the Draft of the United Nations Charter)," NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA, No 2, 1977, p 96.

82. "Perepiska...", Vol I, pp 148-149; Vol II, pp 83, 89.

83. "Sovetskiy Soyuz na mezhdunarodnykh konferentsiyakh", Vol I, pp 48-49, 56-57; 70-71.

84. Ibid., pp 190-191.

85. Ibid., pp 193-194, 343, 355-356.

86. Ibid., p 354.

87. Ibid., pp 348-352.

88. Ibid., pp 164-172, 302-303, 342.

89. Ibid., pp 346-348. For information concerning the importance of the Declaration on the question of universal security, see: Krylov, S. B., "Istoriya sozdaniya Organizatsii Ob'yedinennykh Natsiy" [The History of the Creation of the United Nations], Moscow, 1960.

90. "Vneshnyaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuz...", Vol I, pp 118-119.

91. "Istoriya Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuz", Vol 5, book 1, p 562.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Novaya i noveyshaya istoriya", 1984.

5075

CSO: 1830/262

NATIONAL

KGB MAJOR-GENERAL DIES AFTER SERIOUS ILLNESS

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Feb 85 p 4

[Text] Viktor Petrovich Samodurov, an active participant in the Great Patriotic War and an official of the Committee for State Security of the USSR, passed away in the 65th year of life after a serious illness.

V.P. Samodurov was born on November 11, 1920 in the city of Tashkent. He devoted his entire life to the selfless service of the Motherland, and the affairs of the Communist Party, whose ranks he joined in 1943.

V. P. Samodurov was admitted into the Soviet Army in 1939. From the first days of the Great Patriotic War until its end, he was with the army in the field on the Leningrad and second Belorussian fronts. From 1946 on, he fulfilled administrative responsibilities in the central apparatus of the KGB of the USSR.

His services for the Motherland are noted by the orders of Lenin, the Red Banner, the Fatherland War of the 1st and 2nd classes, the order of the Red Banner of Labor, two orders of the Red Star, many medals and the award "Honorary Member of the State Security Committee."

He gained respect and authority from his comrades at work by his hard-working, party-principledness, his conscientious attitude towards the fulfillment of his service duties, and his professional competence and modesty.

The sacred memory of Viktor Petrovich Samodurov--a true son of the Communist Party and the Soviet People--will be preserved in our hearts eternally.

CSO: 1830/408



NATIONAL

YOUTH PAPER RECOUNTS LIFE OF ATHEIST IN RELIGIOUS FAMILY

PN111515 [Editorial Report] Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 March 1985 carries on page 2 a 1,500-word article by N. Beni under the heading "An Alien House" and the rubric "Moral Choice." Beni describes her tribulations as a child in a pentecostalist family in Krasnoarmeysk, her inability to escape family pressures and involvement with the sect, and the lack of support from the local komсомol. Eventually she leaves home to make a new life on a kolkhoz where she finds sympathetic friends and is at last able to join the komсомol. Now, she explains, her father has taken the rest of the family to another city, and she is worried about her brothers and sisters, but believes that "they will one day find good people, real atheists."

CSO. 1830/400

NATIONAL

BRIEFS

DEATH OF SOVIET MAJOR-GENERAL NOTED--Comrades-in-arms and friends note with deep regret the death of retired major-general Sergei Zakharovich Ostryakov, participant in the Great Patriotic War, member of the CPSU since 1925, and honorary member of the KGB, and express their condolences to the relatives and near friends of the deceased. [Text] [Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Feb 85 p 4]

CSO: 1830/408

REGIONAL

SHEVARDNADZE SPEAKS AT BANNER CEREMONY

PM081432 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 3 Mar 85 pp 1-2

[Gruz INFORM report on 2 March Georgian Party and economic aktiv meeting in the Georgian State Philharmonia Great Hall: "Under the Banner of Labor Valor--to New Heights"]

[Excerpts] The Red Banner...the hammer and sickle, the five-pointed star on a piece of cloth....

Twelve years of Soviet Georgia's life have been marked by this award, which symbolizes our history, our present, and our orientation toward future victories. The firm resolve not only to consolidate what has been achieved, but to augment it and to march under the banner of labor valor toward new heights was reflected in the meeting of the republic's party and economic aktiv devoted to the presentation of the high award to the Georgian SSR.

Y.P. Ryabov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who delivered a speech at the meeting, was warmly greeted by those present.

E.A. Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, who then took the floor, was greeted warmly by those present.

The Red Banner is the symbol of our revolution, the symbol of courage and staunchness, the symbol of Soviet people's labor valor, Comrade E.A. Shevardnadze said. Awarded to our republic for the 12th year in succession, it marks the worthy contribution of Soviet Georgia's working people to ensure the economic and defense might of our great motherland. It is an award for the labor heroism, energy, and spiritual strength of our glorious working people, who can overcome any difficulties in putting into practice our Leninist party's decisions.

This Red Banner, like all the previous ones, was won thanks to the tireless attention and support of the CPSU Central Committee and the country's government. We are inspired by Comrade K.U. Chernenko's good wishes to the



republic's working people. In addressing words of tremendous filial gratitude to the party Central Committee, the Central Committee Politburo, and Konstantin Ustinovich personally for their constant concern for Soviet Georgia, we assure them that the banner presented to the republic will be a tremendous stimulus to further successes on our part and to the fitting completion of the 11th Five-Year Plan, and will lead us to the 27th CPSU Congress.

A great holiday is always preceded by days of intensive work. Thanks to the labor collectives' selfless day-to-day work it was possible to accelerate the rate of growth in production considerably in practically all sectors of the national economy compared with the preceding years of the 5-year plan. That is the most distinctive feature of 1984.

The republic's industrial enterprises and associations, producing above-plan output worth nearly \$280 million, were able not only to overcome the laggardness in production growth rates that was allowed to occur in the 3 preceding years, but even to surpass the 5-year plan target. The plan for the production of output in the top quality category was overfulfilled, with this output accounting for 14.5 percent of the total volume of production. In Georgia, one of the initiators of the movement for an above-plan increase in labor productivity and an additional reduction in prime cost of output, targets in these indicators were considerably surpassed. The reduction in output prime cost alone led to a saving of more than \$48 million.

Agricultural workers did quite good work. The citrus fruit growers achieved impressive results, having fulfilled the 5-year plan for sales of fruit to the state ahead of schedule. Nearly 15 percent more high-grade tea than specified in the annual target was harvested and handed over for processing. The production of vegetables and all types of livestock products increased substantially.

Workers in other sectors of material production and the service sphere also completed the year successfully. The further acceleration of scientific and technical progress is an important criterion of the qualitative developments achieved in the national economy. In the first 4 years of the 5-year plan nearly 28,000 different measures were introduced. Compared with the same period of the previous 5-year plan, the economic results increased 120 percent.

The facts indicate that the republic's economy, like that of the whole country, is, in Comrade K.U. Chernenko's words, becoming increasingly firmly established on a footing of intensive development.

Indicating the sources of the economy's development, Comrade E.A. Shervardnadze noted first and foremost the skillful organizational and political work of party committees and the improvement in the standard and competence of party leadership of economic and cultural building. This is visible in the development and introduction of new methods of activity and in the better, optimum combination of the principles of sector and territorial planning and management. The involvement of local party, soviet, and economic

organs in this important work makes it possible to overcome manifestations of departmental and local self-interest and to constantly watch over the interests of the whole state.

This is indicated convincingly by the activity of rayon agro-industrial organizations and the experiments in progress in Poti and Tbilisi. Similar innovations are being introduced now in Kutaisi, Sukhumi, Rustavi, and other industrial centers in the republic. The task is to accelerate the process of introduction of these forms of management as far as possible.

This is also the basis of the system elaborated in the republican party organization for revealing and bringing into circulation additional reserves for increasing the volume of production and improving the quality of economic activity on a sector basis and a regional basis. The 17 zonal commissions, led by members of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and other republican leaders, systematically monitor progress in the fulfillment of plan targets and pledges in the regions concerned, and where necessary urgently raise and resolve tricky questions. Similar work, but on the scale of sector ministries and large-scale associations and enterprises, is done by the sector departments of the Central Committee and the Council of Ministers and by other republican organs.

On the other hand, economic intensification is not only an economic problem, but also a political problem. In this sense it is very important to skillfully integrate the results of economic and ideological activity.

At the same time, and Comrade K.U. Chernenko stressed this in his election speech, the standard and quality of life in our society improve from year to year to precisely the extent that we work better. Thus, the ideological activists' most important task is to convincingly explain to people the need to improve work in all sectors more quickly and substantially to cultivate consciousness, responsibility, and initiative among them, and to promote the all-around strengthening of discipline everywhere and in everything.

This is particularly important in terms of the fulfillment of this year's tough targets. For the republic's industry to implement the 5-year plan it has to produce in the final year above-plan products worth at least R100 million and prevent any plan amendments. It is important to eliminate sudden failures and window dressing. Everything here depends on steady, enterprising work by every collective, ministry, and department. Equally, the 5-year plan demands a maximum increase in the contribution of laggard as well as leading enterprises. Neither gloom nor complacency and satisfaction with what has been achieved can be tolerated.

Most ministries and departments in the republic's agro-industrial complex have made a substantial additional contribution to the implementation of 5-year plan targets. However, by no means have all the reserves been fully exploited. This year the agro-industrial complex plans to obtain above-plan products worth at least R50 million.

The collectives, which for various reasons are by and large not on target for the 5-year plan, are also in many respects in a position to assist the republic. There is every reason to demand that the Rustavi metallurgists and Zestafoni ferroalloy plant workers and the collectives of the Khimvolokno Association, Batumi oil refinery, and other enterprises in the republic reduce the lag or even catch up. The task is to bring all reserves into play.

Talking about the state of affairs in agriculture, Comrade E.A. Shevardnadze stressed that adverse weather conditions over a number of years have considerably hindered the fulfillment of the 5-year plan on gross agricultural output. In order to make up the lost ground and implement the 5-year plan target it is necessary to produce above-plan products worth R653 million this year, which is 33 percent more than was achieved in 1984. Certainly, this is a very difficult task, especially as an unprecedentedly cold winter, high winds, and heavy snow have created difficult conditions in a number of regions of the republic, particularly in the subtropical zone. All possible steps are now being taken to reduce to a minimum any damage that natural calamities may cause to all sectors of the national economy. It is important to maintain the vigorous and selfless activity and do all we can to ensure that the consequences of the severe winter do not have an adverse effect on the fulfillment of the plan for this year and the 11th Five-Year Plan as a whole.

Construction workers are faced with big tasks in the final phase of the 5-year plan. It is necessary to ensure the full assimilation of funds allocated to the republic for housing construction. The big social problem of eliminating the shacks and basement dwellings must be resolved this year.

Every effort must be made to ensure the commissioning of the planned capacities of the Kutaisi motor vehicle plant, the Rustavi metallurgical plant, the Metekhi building materials plant, the Kaspi poultry unit, and other production facilities.

We expect high returns from the sector, especially now that the ministries of construction and rural construction have been united as an experiment. This step ought to ensure a substantial breakthrough in improving construction efficiency and put a stop to the lack of coordination between contracting organizations, parallelism, and other organizational failings.

The successful completion of this year and the 5-year plan as a whole also largely depends on the efficient, uninterrupted work of transportation workers. Not only plan fulfillment but the on-schedule delivery of all freight is required here. The work of transportation, like other sectors, must be assessed not only in percentages, but primarily by end results.

In order to work better it is necessary to look ahead in good time, eradicate bottlenecks in economic activity, and resolve the urgent problems of economic development. The quest for the best possible ways of bringing all existing production potential into play is of particular importance in this regard.



Now that the destiny of the 11th Five-Year Plan is being decided the prime task for the leaders of ministries, departments, enterprises, associations, and all party and soviet organs is to ensure the rational use of existing capacities and equipment and prevent stoppages in technological upgrading [perekhody]. The on-schedule, smooth delivery of all the material and technical resources required by enterprises, the strengthening of plan, production, and technological discipline, the improvement of the organization of repair services, and the swift reorganization of production to produce new output guarantee corresponding returns on the immense funds invested in the economy's material-technical base.

One of the most urgent problems today is to effect savings of fuel and energy resources. An overall system has been worked out in this sphere. The Georgian Communist Party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms systematically review questions of observing limits discipline. Much organizational work is done by the party Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the republican Council of Ministers, the Central Committee Party Commission, the People's Control Committee, the prosecutor's office organs, party, soviet and administrative organs, and public organizations. Nevertheless, many enterprises and organizations are still wrecking the targets for savings of fuel and energy resources, while some even allow the overexpenditure of these resources. Only one-half of the republic's enterprises are participating in the socialist competition to save electricity.

This is occurring at a time when the actual savings of material resources are themselves, under current conditions, an important source for ensuring production growth. Many enterprise leaders fail to take into account the fact that the elaboration and implementation of plans for organizational and technological measures aimed at savings are one of the criteria of overall work efficiency and quality. In addition to the appropriate services, the leaders of shops and sections, technology specialists, machine operators, economists, and front-ranking workers must actively tackle the implementation of these plans.

At present most enterprises and organizations in the republic have elaborated practical measures aimed at implementing the CPSU Central Committee Politburo directive: to work 2 days in the year with raw materials, fuel, and energy that have been saved. In Tbilisi, for example, the monitoring system encompasses all aspects of material production, and today its operations cover more than 450 resource consumers. Tbilisi's citizens have calculated that they will be able to work not 2 but 3 whole days with resources that have been saved through the year. This initiative must be supported by the republic's party organizations.

In this regard it is important to introduce the achievements of science and technology even more consistently and actively. The task is to retool all sectors of the republic's economy as soon as possible on the basis of widespread use of advanced equipment and technology.

We must also aim to resolve the problem of further labor productivity growth on the basis of utilizing the achievements of scientific and technical progress. This is the main condition for the intensification of production. Although the republic has coped with its pledges as regards this indicator's growth and has honorably fulfilled the party target, by no means everything in this sphere is the way we would like it to be. Not everything has been resolved, and this applies particularly to the above-plan reduction of output prime costs. After all, this question is most closely interwoven with the tasks of improving the financial position of enterprises and associations and strengthening financial, accounting, and payments discipline.

In order to work even better and more efficiently and achieve greater intensification of production, we must improve even further the forms and methods of managing economic activity. Much in this sphere depends to a decisive extent on cadres and on their professional skills and competence.

At the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee plenum yesterday, E.A. Shevardnadze said, we conducted a special examination of questions of work with cadres. Today it may be added that it is our cadres who have secured for the republic its latest victory in All-Union Socialist Competition. The first Challenge Red Banner won for the results of 1973 differs qualitatively from the present one. The search for production reserves is increasingly becoming an in-depth one and requires from cadres a high degree of intellect, extensive knowledge, and modern economic leader and production commander cadres, is also constantly being improved. Cadres do not grow of their own accord, they must be purposefully selected, educated, and shaped.

The intensification of social production requires more than ever a high degree of economic culture in every worker and his creative, politically considered approach toward the matter assigned to him. A paramount role in resolving this task belongs to the system of Marxist-Leninist education, lecture propaganda, and all forms of oral and visual political agitation. The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Republican Coordination Council for the working people's economic education must make a substantial contribution to this important matter. A real return from economic propaganda largely depends on its further improvement in newspapers, journals, and radio and television broadcasts.

In his election speech Comrade K.U. Chernenko graphically described the tasks Soviet people have to resolve. Everything must be done to make our motherland stronger and more beautiful, to make the life of each Soviet person better and fuller, and to make a lasting, stable peace. For this, work is necessary; constructive, creative, shock work.

Our main party and civic duty now, Comrade E.A. Shevardnadze said in conclusion, is the successful completion of the 11th Five-Year Plan and a fitting greeting to the 27th CPSU Congress. The serious tasks facing the republic's working people in the current economic year demand that all levers and all opportunities be used for their successful solution. One such effective means should be the Leninist communist subbotnik to be held on 20 April that will mark the 115th anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birth.

Their enthusiastic predilection for action and creative approach toward the solution of topical problems and the cohesion of the working people and representatives of all nations and nationalities living in the Georgian SSR around their dear Leninist party and its Central Committee allow me, on behalf of the participants in the meeting and the entire party and economic aktiv and the republic's communists and workers, to assure the CPSU Central Committee Politburo headed by Comrade K.U. Chernenko that Soviet Georgia will continue to augment its contribution to our great fatherland's nationwide treasure, will cope unconditionally with the targets for the 5-year plan, and will gratify the motherland yet again with its successes.

CSO: 1830/418



REGIONAL

GAPUROV ADDRESSES TURKMEN AGRICULTURAL MEETING

GF101320 Ashkhabad Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 5 Mar 85

[Excerpts] A republican meeting of the agro-industrial complex was held in Ashkhabad today. It analyzed the work of the republic's agricultural organs during the past year and discussed the tasks and the progress in fulfilling the plans and socialist pledges during the last year of the 11th 5-Year Plan and the 5-year plan as a whole.

Cotton growers; machine operators; [word indistinct]; vegetable growers; livestock breeders; leaders and experts of the farms; aviators; representatives of the party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations; experts of the agro-industrial complex; leaders of the ministries and departments and representatives of the press, television, and radio were invited to the meeting.

Present at the meeting's presidium were Comrades Annaorazov, Boyko, Gapurov, Zhulenev, Makarkin, Mishchenko, Mollayeva, Rachkov, Karryyev; Schmidt and Khar'kov, members and candidate members of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Bureau; and also members of the delegations from the fraternal republics led by Khodzhayev, deputy chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers; Kerimov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR State Committee for the Supply of Production Equipment for Agriculture; Maksumov, deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers; leading farmers, livestock breeders, leaders of the progressive farms and veterans of the agricultural production.

Comrade Gapurov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, delivered a report at the meeting.

Noting the definite and positive progress in the agricultural production the participants in the meeting spoke about the available unused reserves in the work of the workers of the fields and farms and other sectors of the agro-industrial complex for expanding livestock and agricultural products and for improving their quality and [words indistinct]. A considerable part of the farms slowly introduced the interfarm [word indistinct] and other progressive forms and methods of management. Systematic work for [word indistinct] the soil is not being carried out in the economic [word indistinct] of farms and violations are observed in the agrotechnology dedicated to the agricultural crops and in the technology of livestock production. The leaders and experts of some farms and agricultural organs [word indistinct] evaluate the results

of work and [word indistinct] shortcomings. Determining the course of developing the sector the participants in the meeting stressed the importance of increasing the productivity of every hectare, introducing industrial methods of farming, and absolutely fulfilling the contract pledges.

The participants in the meeting were warmly greeted by the heads of the delegations of the fraternal republics, Comrade Khodzhayev, Kerimov, and Maksumov. The meeting participants have demonstrated a unanimous aspiration for verifying the decisions of the October 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the directives and findings contained in the speech of Comrade Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and for making an adequate contribution to the implementation of the country's food program. [The meeting] decided to continue the traditional socialist emulation with the fraternal republics, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, and Tajikistan.

CSO: 1830/401

REGIONAL

GAPUROV ADDRESSES PARTY COMMISSION MEETING

GF101800 Ashgabat Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 6 Mar 85

[Text] A meeting of the chairmen of the party commissions of the republic's party committees was held today at the Turkmenistan Communist Party Central Committee headquarters. Invited to the meeting were: the secretaries of the organs of the party raykoms, gorkoms and obkoms; responsible workers of the organs of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee; the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers; the republic's committee of the people's control; the health organs; and representatives of the community and the press.

Comrade Berdeyev, chairman of the Party Commission of the Turkmenistan Communist Party Central Committee, delivered a report on work practices and the tasks of the party commissions of the party committees for further consolidating party and state discipline, and improving control activities. The reporters and the speakers noted that the party commissions of the party committees are carrying out certain work for consolidating party and state discipline. At the same time, it noted that there are shortcomings and derelictions in the works of the party commissions, and their control activity.

Concrete measures were taken to eliminate them. The participants of the meeting exchanged work experiences and made suggestions that are aimed at further improving the activity of the party commissions.

Comrade Kirabava, member of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a speech at the meeting. Comrade Gapurov, first secretary of the Turkmenistan Communist Party Central Committee, delivered a speech at the meeting. He dwelt at length on the tasks of the party commissions of the republic's party committee for further consolidating party and state discipline and their control activity.

Participating in the meeting were Comrades Annaorazov, Boyko, Zhulenev, Makarkin, Mishchenko, Mollayeva, Rachkov, Charyyev, Shmidt, and Khar'kov, members and candidate members of the Turkmenistan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau.

CSO: 1830/401

REGIONAL

PARTY SECRETARY BRIEFS UKRAINIAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

AU080855 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian 3 Mar 85 p 3

[RATAU report: "Responsible Tasks of Social Scientists"]

[Excerpts] Chiefs of social sciences departments at higher educational institutions held a republic-level conference-seminar in Kharkov. It was attended by chairmen of rector's councils at higher educational institutions, responsible functionaries of the Ukrainian Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and of a number of the republic's ministries and departments, chiefs of obkom and gorkom departments for science and education institutions, and responsible workers of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

The conference-seminar was opened by F. M. Rudich, chief of the Science and Education Institutions Department of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. A report on the topical problems of raising the quality of teaching social sciences in the higher schools and of increasing their influence on students was delivered by A. S. Kapto, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo candidate member and secretary. In the report much attention was dedicated to the role of social science departments at the republic's higher educational institutions in exposing bourgeois ideology and in conducting counterpropaganda. It was emphasized that the class adversary has intensified his pressure recently in all aspects of the social sciences, trying to attack the very foundation of real socialism. American imperialism has intensified subversive activity against the countries of the socialist community, having officially recognized that the waging of "psychological war" is a function of the state.

Active use has been made of the remnants of the bourgeois nationalist rabble for anti-Soviet purposes. Under these conditions social scientists are called upon to expose more profoundly and in a well reasoned manner the antiscientist and anti-socialist essence of bourgeois pseudoscientific conceptions, to unmask more resolutely the political speculations of bourgeois and bourgeois-nationalist falsifiers, and to rebuff firmly the subversive, illegal propaganda actions of imperialism.

While training the future specialists in Marxist-Leninist theory, it is necessary to inculcate in them a deep conviction in the correctness of communist ideals, to foment a class attitude to the analysis of social processes and an immunity to bourgeois ideology, and to cultivate the lofty feeling of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism.

The conference participants were addressed by S. N. Mukha, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo candidate member and chairman of the Ukrainian KGB; V. P. Kitayev, lecturer in the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department; V. A. Ivashko, Kharkov Obkom secretary; and A. G. Yatsina, Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee secretary.



REGIONAL

ARMENIAN SUPREME SOVIET ELECTION RESULTS

GF171002 Yerevan SOVETAKAN AYASTAN in Armenian 1 Mar 85 p 1

[Text] On Sunday, 24 February 1985, the elections of the 19th convocation of the Armenian SSR people's deputies local soviets were held in the Armenian SSR.

The elections of the local bodies of the state were held under the slogan of the 27th CPSU Congress, the active preparation for the 40th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the great fatherland war and the fulfillment and overfulfillment of the plan targets of 1985 and the entire 11th 5-Year Plan period.

The republic's workers accepted with great enthusiasm the speech of Comrade K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the prelectoral meeting of the Kuybishev Electoral Ogruk Electors in Moscow.

Due to its achievements during the 10th and the 4 years of the 11th 5-Year Plan period and successes in the economy, science, and culture, for the 9th time our republic was recognized victorious in the all-union socialist emulation and has been awarded the order of the red banner by the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the AUCTU and All-Union Komsomol Central Committee. This fact resulted in huge political and labor activity by the workers.

A total of 9,777 electoral commissions have been formed for the Armenian SSR people's deputies local soviets elections and 94,610 people have worked there.

The elections have been held in 580 local soviets, in 37 people's deputies rayon soviets, 27 city soviets, 7 rayon soviets in Yerevan City, in 31 borough soviets, and 478 rural soviets.

For all local soviets elections 27,441 electoral ogruks have been formed; 3,236 for rayon soviets elections, 2,482 for city soviets, 1,316 for Yerevan City rayon soviets, 1,838 borough soviets, and 18,208 village soviets elections.

A total of 99.99 percent of the electors have participated in the elections of the rayon soviets of people's deputies, 99.99 percent in the city soviets elections, 99.99 percent in the Yerevan city rayon soviets, 99.99 percent in the borough soviets elections and 99.99 percent in the rural soviets elections.

The number of electors in favor of the communists and non-party bloc candidates at the rayon soviet elections is 99.99 percent of the overall number of electors, at the city soviet elections 99.99 percent, at the Yerevan City rayon soviets elections 99.99 percent, at the borough soviet elections 99.97 percent and at the rural soviets elections 99.99 percent.

The votes against the deputization candidates at the rayon soviets elections is 0.01 percent of the overall number of electors, at the city soviet elections 0.01, at the Yerevan City rayons soviets elections 0.01 percent, at the borough soviets elections 0.03 percent at the rural soviets elections 0.01 percent.

There are no results recognized as unauthentic. A total of 27,441 deputies have been elected at the local soviets of the 19th convocation of the Armenian SSR people's deputies. A total of 13,682 or 49.9 percent of the deputies are women, 11,862 or 43.2 percent are CPSU members or candidate members, 15,579 or 56.8 percent are non-party members, 6,607 or 24.1 percent are all-union komsomol members, 19,158 or 69.8 percent are laborers and kolkhoz workers and 9,369 or 34.1 percent are youths below the age of 30; a total of 14,534 or 53 percent of the elected deputies have not been deputies of the corresponding soviets of the previous convocation.

The elections of the local soviets of the people's deputies once again displayed the unshakable unity of the communists and non-party bloc and the close assembly of the republic's workers around the CPSU and its Central Committee, under the chairmanship of prominent party and state worker Comrade K.U. Chernenko. It displayed their unshakable determination to actively struggle for the sake of the fulfillment of the 26th CPSU Congress resolutions and to welcome the 27th CPSU Congress in a worthwhile way.

CSO: 1338/41

REGIONAL

ARMENIAN SSR SUPREME SOVIET HOLDS REGULAR SESSION

GF170810 Yerevan SOVETAKAN AYASTAN in Armenian 1 Mar 85 p 1

[Text] The routine session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium reviewed the results of the elections of the 11th convocation of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and the 19th convocation of the Armenian SSR People's Deputies local soviets and adopted a decision in this regard. On the occasion of this question, Comrade B.Y. Sarkisov, chairman of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, delivered a speech.

The session heard a report from the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers on the realization of the proposals made by the electors of the 11th convocation of the USSR Supreme Soviet deputies at the Armenian SSR and corresponding decision was adopted. It pointed out that a part of the proposals have been fulfilled while the others are being fulfilled and are projected by corresponding plans.

The session heard a report by G.A. Martirosyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR People's Control Committee, on the committee's 1984 activities. Noting the committee's positive work, the presidium urged the committee to eliminate existing shortcomings, to constantly perfect the activities of the republic's people control bodies in light of the resolutions of the party's 26th Congress and the instructions and assessments mentioned in the speech of Comrade K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the all-union people's control conference.

The basic directions of the activities of the rayon and city soviets were reviewed as well as the organizational mass work of the local soviets of the Armenian SSR People's Deputies in 1984. The republic's rayon and city soviets' executives committees were urged to take necessary measures to eliminate the existing shortcomings, to copy positive experiments to perfect organizational mass work in light of the resolutions of the party's 26th Congress and the April 1984 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, and to ensure the successful realization of the tasks set by the party before the local soviets of the people's deputies.

The presidium heard a report by L.G. Yeghyazaryan, first deputy Armenian SSR light industry minister, on the work carried out at the ministry's enterprises toward the fulfillment of the USSR law on "the promotion of the role in the

control of the labor collectives and enterprises, establishments and organizations" and the report by L. Mandalyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Industry Commission, on the said question.

The Armenian SSR Light Industry Ministry along with the Republican Committee of Textile and Light Industry Workers Trade Union are taking concrete steps to realize the law requirements on the labor collectives and to further raise the political and labor activity and creative initiative of workers and employees, which has a constant influence on production control and people's education and contributes to the productive solution of the questions set before the labor collectives of the branch.

It also noted that situation is different in various enterprises. The presidium adopted a decision aimed at ensuring at all the enterprises of the branch the undeviated fulfillment of the law, at the display of daily attention toward the improvement of the social, housing, and cultural conditions of workers and the productive use of the plenipotentiaries and capabilities of the labor collectives in the solution of these questions.

The session reviewed the question pertaining to the preparation of the celebrations on the 40th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory during the 1941-1945 great Fatherland War.

The meeting reviewed results of the revisions of the written and verbal petitions received by citizens in 1984 at the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet, the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the local soviets of people's deputies in the republic. It pointed out that by fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee instructions, the work is being perfected and measures are being taken to eliminate the shortcomings.

The presidium's session also reviewed other questions dealing with the republic's state life on the occasion of which corresponding Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees and decisions were adopted.

CSO: 1838/41



REGIONAL

ARMENIAN SUPREME SOVIET INDUSTRY COMMISSION MEETS

GF051512 Yerevan SOVETAKAN AYASTAN in Armenian 10 Feb 85 p 2

[Text] A recent session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Industry Commission heard a report by the republic's light industry minister, A. Gevorkyan, on the state of implementation of the USSR law at the ministry's enterprises with regard to "raising their role in managing the work of labor collectives and enterprises, establishments, and organizations." The session was chaired by commission Chairman K. Mandalyan. It was pointed out that guided by the party and government's decisions, the Armenian SSR Light Industry Ministry, with the cooperation of its enterprises and the republic's Textile and Light Industry Workers Trade Union Committee, has established and realized concrete measures to fulfill the requirements of the law and to further raise the political and labor activity and creative initiative of the workers and employees. All are contributing to the productive solution of the tasks set before the labor collectives of the branch. The plan targets are being fulfilled and overfulfilled with regard to production and sales output, increased labor productivity, reduction of output prime cost, and introduction of modern technology and technics.

In many enterprises the labor collectives have started to more actively participate in inspecting the economic and social development plans, in strengthening production discipline, and in improving work organization. The team method of work organization and remuneration has been widely introduced, with 60.7 percent of all the workers of light industry enterprises working in such teams. This is of important significance in the sense that this year the enterprises will work under experimental economic conditions, which is expected to further expand the rights of the enterprises and raise their responsibility toward the final work results.

The commission established corresponding recommendations aimed at eliminating shortcomings in the total fulfillment of the USSR law at all the republic's Light Industry Ministry enterprises with regard to "raising their role in the management of the work of labor collectives and enterprises, establishments, and organizations."

CSO: 1838/42

REGIONAL

ARMENIAN SSR PROCURATORIAL BODIES MEET

GF051702 Yerevan SOVETAKAN AYASTAN in Armenian 7 Feb 85 p 3

[Excerpts] During the expanded session of the Armenian SSR procuratorial collegiate, participated by rayon and city public prosecutors, the 1984 work results of procuratorial bodies were reviewed, in addition to the tasks of furthering law reinforcement and discipline in light of the CPSU Central Committee decision on the "implementation of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee plenum decisions at the Armenian SSR Party Organization."

The speech of Armenian SSR Procurator S. Osypyan pointed out that by fulfilling the 26th CPSU Congress decisions and the 27th Armenian Communist Party resolutions as well as those of the CPSU Central Committee plenums after the congress, the procuratorial bodies have implemented comprehensive measures aimed at improving the struggle against offenses and violation of laws. The struggle has become more purposeful and its efficiency has increased. In 1984, the number of offenses in the republic decreased and the incidence of grave offenses was reduced.

Last year, legal and civil measures were implemented on a constant and large-scale basis against mismanagement, the under-delivery of goods, excessive registration fees, the production of unqualified goods, shortcomings and work stoppages in construction, and other violations of economic law. Procuratorial supervision has been increased and stringency and principality implemented during the evaluation and prevention of law violations.

At the same time, the collegiate pointed out the efficiency of the measures aimed at strengthening law and order is insufficient. In certain locations the procuratorial bodies are slow in restructuring their work to strengthen the struggle against plundering, bribery, and speculation.

The collegiate concentrated its attention on formulating practical ways to raise the standard of work of all circles of procuratorial bodies and on the perfection of their work style and methods. It evaluated the shortcomings and noted concrete ways to eliminate them. The need to improve the work of law preservation bodies, particularly coordination in the struggle against grave offenses, was pointed out to the procurators of the rayons and cities.

Attention was focused on the timely prevention and detection of offenses and on the strict implementation of the law during the registration and solution

of complaints and reports on law violations. The collegiate demanded that the procurators decisively raise procuratorial supervision activities in strengthening state and labor discipline and increase the utilization of public efforts and the capabilities of labor collectives for that purpose.

A.I. Zhukov, chief of USSR Procuratorial Department, delivered a speech at the session.

The collegiate session was attended by G.M. Voskanyan secretary of the Armenian Communist party Central Committee; M.M. Davtyan, chief of Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Administrative Organs Department; G.S. Shaginyan, Armenian SSR minister of internal affairs; A.A. Gevorkyan, Armenian SSR justice minister; and other officers of the republic's law preservation bodies.

CSO: 1838/42

## REGIONAL

### KASSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS ON 1984 PLAN FULFILLMENT

Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 85 p 1

[Unsigned article: "At the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The February 6 Session of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers which examined the results of fulfillment of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the Kazakh SSR and the 1984 Republic State Budget also examined status of plan fulfillment by Kazakh SSR's industry during January 1985.

It was noted at the session that collectives of trade unions and enterprises, republic construction projects and organizations, in following the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the most recent CPSU Central Committee Plenums and the 15th Kazakhstan CP Congress, have broadly expanded socialist competition and have ensured the further development of public production and an increase in its effectiveness in 1984.

The plan was fulfilled by industry ahead of schedule through realizing the goods production and issue of most of the more important kinds of products. The total production volume increased by 3.2 percent in comparison with 1983 and 84 percent of the increase in industrial production volume was obtained as a result of an increase in labor productivity. Collectives which have not fulfilled their obligations for product deliveries have become fewer.

Much attention has been given to increasing the output of public consumption goods. The production volume of goods for cultural, personal and economic purposes has increased by 11.2 percent in comparison with the previous year.

In spite of year-long unfavorable conditions, agricultural workers turned over 7.3 million tons of grain to the government. More raw cotton, potatoes, vegetables, melons, cattle, poultry, milk and eggs were sold than in the previous year.

In construction, the volumes of limits put into production of capital investments and construction and installation work have increased in comparison with 1983. Many large production capacities and projects, more than 5 million square meters of residences, almost 65,000 undeveloped school sites and 33,000 sites for children's preschool institutions have been put into operation.



Programs for raising the population's standard of living have been successively implemented and the average monthly income of laborers and white collar workers has increased. Retail goods turnover has increased 4.3 percent and the sales volume of everyday services has grown by 6.9 percent.

In 1984, the Kazakh SSR state budget was realized at 101.9 percent through revenues.

It was also noted at the session that several ministries, republic departments and oblispolkoms have not ensured the fulfillment of quotas planned for separate types of production, the putting of production capacities into operation, the growth of labor productivity and lowering of production costs.

The plan for turning over cattle, milk and produce to the government has not been fulfilled by the sovkhozes and kolkhozes.

The Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers has obliged the ministries, republic departments, oblispolkoms and the Alma-Ata Gorispolkom to develop and realize measures on the complete fulfillment and over-fulfillment of the quotas planned and accepted for 1985 by worker collectives of socialist commitment while following the directions and conclusions contained in Comrade K. U. Chernenko's speech at the November 15, 1984 Session of the CPSU Central Committee of the Politburo. They should also be keeping in mind not only to consolidate, but to increase favorable improvements in the development of the economic structure which have been attained during recent years and to worthily greet the 27th CPSU Congress and the 40th Anniversary of the Soviet people's victory and the Great October War.

President of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers, N.A. Nazarbayev addressed the session.

12614  
CSO: 1830/329

REGIONAL

PRAVDA REPORTS GEORGIAN PLENUM ON CADRE POLICY

PM051241 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 85 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent G. Lebanidze report: "Cadres at the Center of Attention. From a Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Excerpts] Tbilisi--A routine Georgian Communist Party Central Committee plenum has been held. It discussed the report of the republic Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, which had been distributed in advance to the plenum participants, on progress in fulfilling the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee plenum decision on cadre questions adopted in 1979 and the party organization's tasks in further improving the selection, placing, and training of cadres and improving their work style in the light of the propositions and conclusions contained in Comrade K.U. Chernenko's speeches and works.

E. Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, who addressed the plenum, and the participants in the debate pointed out that today the question of work with cadres is viewed on a qualitatively new basis, from fundamentally new positions, in the light of the decisions of the 26th party congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums and the party's guidelines on the need to raise organizational and political work to the level of the requirements of developed socialism. The CPSU Central Committee poses the question not just of improving work with cadres but of cadre policy at the contemporary stage.

This is also how the Georgian party organization seeks to organize its work. In recent years much has been done here to assert the spirit of trust and respect for cadres in conjunction with principled demandingness and exactingness and to intensify still further the struggle against negative phenomena and violations of socialist legality and law and order. All this, together with the growth of cadres' ideological, political, and professional standards, the enhancement of their responsibility for the entrusted task, and the strengthening of executive discipline, has enabled the republic to achieve the accelerated development of the economy.

Politically mature leaders devoted to the party's cause have grown and emerged at different levels in the republic. Almost all workers on a republic scale are people with higher education, many of them also have party political education, and one in every six has the academic degree of a doctor or candidate of sciences. It is significant that approximately 70 percent of these workers began their careers as manual workers, kolkhoz members, or ordinary specialists and became involved in party and public work in labor collectives. It is also a very important fact that all the nation's main ethnic groups living in the republic are widely represented among the leaders.

The promotion of leaders with regard to the opinions and recommendations of primary party organizations, labor collectives, and the public is increasingly being asserted in cadre work. The plenum supported the practice of hearing communists' reports in open party meetings, along with the approval of party references. Some 1,045 senior party, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol officials and 4,520 leaders of enterprises, organizations, and establishments have already been through this "party certification." The work of the majority of them received a positive assessment. However, 512 leaders were subjected to impartial serious criticism and were warned about the need to reorganize their work style. Essentially negative references were approved for 326 leading workers, with a party penalty being imposed or the question of the inadvisability of their continuing to hold their post being raised.

Instances of violations of the party principles for selecting and placing cadres were also cited from the plenum rostrum. In particular, there are instances of people being sent into leading work by virtue of personal devotion, kinship, or coming from the same home district, or for mercenary motives. Such cases have occurred in Zugdidi Gorispolkom, in Borzhomskiy Rayon, and in other places.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Coordinating Council is doing much that is useful in work with cadres. Similar councils are operating under party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms. The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Center for Raising the Qualifications of Party, Soviet, and Economic Leaders is working fruitfully. Probationary periods for workers in Central Committee sections, republic soviet, trade union, and Komsomol organs, ministries and departments, base enterprises, and organizations are justifying themselves. One-third of party gorkom and raykom first secretaries, for example, have already received such training.

The plenum instructed leading cadres to learn to think in an economically competent and modern way and to rid themselves more decisively of the established stereotypes of thinking whereby the quantitative, "bulk" approach plainly prevailed over the qualitative approach. It was pointed out in this connection that the existing schools and seminars of economic education and their training programs are in many ways obsolete and do not meet today's requirements.

The need to further improve cadres' ideological education has been advanced as an important task. Many leading workers have an insufficient grasp of modern methods of organizing the ideological education process and of knowledge in the spheres of sociology, social psychology, and pedagogics.

In a unanimously adopted resolution the plenum assured the CPSU Central Committee that Georgia's party organization, improving work with cadres, will achieve new successes in the republic's economic and social development and greet the upcoming 27th CPSU Congress with worthy deeds.

CSO: 1830/418



REGIONAL

EDITOR OF SOVETAKAN AYASTAN DIES

GF030955 Yerevan SOVETAKAN AYASTAN in Armenian 20 Feb 85 p 1

[Text] The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers declare with profound grief that Bakundz Grachik Ananikyan, editor of SOVETAKAN AYASTAN newspaper and chairman of the Armenian Journalists Union, died at the age of 59. Condolences are expressed to the family of the deceased.

CSO: 1838/42

REGIONAL

KASSR STATE FILM COMMITTEE BOARD MEETS

[Editorial Report] Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian on 7 March 1985 carries on page 3 a 300-word KazTAG report on the 5 March meeting of the KaSSR State Committee for Cinematography board. At the meeting, the accomplishments of the past year and goals for the coming year were discussed. It was noted that there has been an improvement in documentary film-making. However, the same cannot be said of feature film-making, in spite of improvements in available material and technology. Measures were set to significantly improve the creative work of cinematographers.

KASSR: ZNANIYE SOCIETY BOARD HOLDS PLENUM

[Editorial Report] Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian on 7 March 1985 carries on page 3 a 300-word KazTAG report entitled "To Perfect Lecture Propaganda" on the 5 March Fifth Plenum of the board of the KaSSR "Znaniye" society. It was noted that demands on the lecture staff have increased recently, and that the level of oral propaganda does not fully correspond to contemporary needs. Lecture themes are often only vaguely related to a particular audience's situation, and the training and re-training of lecture cadres is insufficiently effective. Means to eliminate the shortcomings and to raise the quality and effectiveness of lecture propaganda were established.

CSO: 1830/410

REGIONAL

AWARDS TO UZBEK OBLAST, RAYON, THEATER

[Editorial Report] Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian on 7 March 1985 carries on page 1 two articles announcing awards to Namangan Oblast and Bekabadskiy Rayon of Tashkent Oblast of the Challenge Red Banner of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the AUCCTU, and the Komsomol Central Committee. The award to Namangan Oblast, bestowed by Uzbek CP Central Committee first secretary Usmankhodzhayev for high achievements in socialist competition and successful plan fulfillment, was announced at the end of a 500-word UzTAG article titled "Bringing All Reserves into Play." The award to Bekabadskiy Rayon was noted in a 100-word UzTAG article titled "Bestowing the Banner," which also noted that the award was made by Uzbek People's Control Committee chairman V.A. Khaydurov at a solemn meeting on 5 March.

On 10 March 1985 PRAVDA VOSTOKA carries on page 1 a 300-word UzTAG article titled "An Award for the Theater's Banner" announcing the bestowing of the Order of the Labor Red Banner on the Tashkent State Russian Academic Drama Theater imeni Gorkiy, in honor of its fiftieth anniversary and of services to the development of Soviet theatrical art. First secretary of the Uzbek CP Central Committee Usmankhodzhayev pinned the award to the theater's banner at the 9 March anniversary party in which members and candidate members of the Uzbek CP Central Committee Buro participated.

KARAKALPAK OBKOM REMOVES MEMBERS FOR SHORTCOMINGS

[Editorial Report] Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian on 6 March 1985 carries on page 1 a 200-word UzTAG article titled "Plenum of the Karakalpak Party Obkom" announcing the 5 March meeting in Nukus of a plenum of the Karakalpak Oblast party committee. Speeches were read at the plenum by Karakalpak obkom first secretary K. Salykov and Uzbek CP Central Committee 2nd secretary T.N. Osetrov. The plenum ratified the comprehensive plan for realization of the reform program for the elementary and vocational schools of the autonomous republic for the period 1985-1990. It also considered some organizational questions. A.I. Balakin was relieved of his duties as obkom second secretary in connection with transfer to other work. In his place the plenum appointed D.D. Berkov, formerly an instructor in the CPSU Central Committee's Department of Agriculture and the Food Industry. The plenum relieved K.Ye. Yusupov of his duties as secretary and member of the obkom buro because of shortcomings and appointed in his place M.K. Aralbayev, formerly a lecturer in the Uzbek CP Central Committee's department of propaganda and agitation. The plenum likewise relieved K. Rzayev of his duties as member of the obkom buro because of shortcomings.

CSC: 1830/416

REGIONAL

READERS RESPOND TO UKRAINIAN PAPER'S SURVEY ON ALCOHOL ABUSE

[Editorial Report] Kiev RADYANS'KA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian 16 February 1985 carries on page 4 a 600-word article by M. Volobuyev entitled "Society Against 'The Green Snake.'" The article describes a questionnaire printed late last year in RADYANS'KA UKRAYINA which solicited readers' opinions on the effectiveness of local anti-alcohol programs and on what further measures should be taken in this area. It gives the results of the survey, to which almost 3,000 readers responded. The first question--"Is enough preventative work in the struggle against alcoholism carried out in your collective?"--brought a negative response from the largest number of readers. Others answered that enough is carried out but that it is not effective and cited instances in which labor or agricultural collective leaders, "in order to improve the indicators in the struggle against alcoholism," "didn't notice" people who were working while intoxicated. A third group answered simply that the anti-alcohol struggle is being carried out well in their enterprises and schools. The second question--"What, in your opinion, should be done to make the struggle against 'the green snake' more effective?"--produced the greatest amount of discussion. Suggestions included restricting the operating hours of liquor stores and not allowing them to be located near enterprises; introducing harsher penalties for selling liquor to minors or to people already under the influence and for making moonshine; and conducting anti-alcohol information courses and providing places for young people to gather where alcohol would not be sold. "A significant number of readers proposed the introduction of a 'dry law,'" Volobuyev noted, "And they base their decision on the fact that, according to them, all other means being used today, including preventative work in workplaces and schools and at home, administrative punishments, and the work of law enforcement organs, are at present insufficient and ineffective." The last question--"Is there a sobriety club in your factory, village or school?"--brought an overwhelmingly negative response. People argued that there is a great need for such clubs in towns and villages everywhere, not only in the republic's few largest cities. Volobuyev concludes that "it is impossible to disagree with this idea."

CSO: 1811/24



REGIONAL

KASSR: CENTRAL COMMITTEE BURO MEETS

[Editorial Report] Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 March 1985 carries on page 1 a 500-word report entitled "In the Kazakh CP Central Committee Buro." At a regular session, the Buro discussed the work of the Alma-Ata oblast party organization in improving the effective use of irrigated land and noted that the party organization is mobilizing workers to do so. However, reserves and opportunities for the further development of land reclamation are not being fully utilized. In many farms agricultural standards are low and the organization of and payment for labor is inadequate. Certain party committees, soviet and economic organs do not provide for efficient work of branches of the agro-industrial complex and accept negligence. The Buro decreed that active measures be taken to ensure the effective use of irrigated lands and the growth of agricultural production. It also stressed the need to strengthen discipline and order. The Buro also discussed the construction of educational and health establishments in the Semipalatinski oblast. The pace of construction does not correspond to party and government requirements, due to an insufficiency of workers and equipment, as well as other problems. The Buro directed the oblast party committees to increase the requirements placed on managers to fulfill the plan and to make up for lost time in the current five-year plan. The KaSSR Ministry of Construction of Heavy Industry Enterprises and the KaSSR Ministry of Rural Construction are directed to quickly take measures to significantly increase the pace of oblast construction.

CSO: 1830/404

REGIONAL

RETURNED LITHUANIAN EXILE HITS EMIGRE ORGANIZATIONS

PM011155 [Editorial Report] Moscow KOMSOMOL'SKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 February 1985 carries on page 2 a 1,800-word Vilnius-dated interview with Vitautas Alseyka by N. Lashkevich. In the interview, entitled "Underlings" and carried under the "Eye Witness" rubric, Alseyka recounts his experiences as an emigre from 1944 until 1972, when he returned to Lithuania. He tells how he worked for the FRG-based "Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania" as editor of its information bulletin and how "many prominent figures in various emigre organizations," including the one he worked for, had "close links with Western intelligence services" and were motivated by "selfish interests and personal gain." He claims that the supreme committee for the liberation of Lithuania receives "large sums of money from the CIA." As for the Lithuanian newspaper (DRAUGAS), for which he worked in Chicago, he describes the "unscrupulousness of the editors of the emigre clerics' mouthpiece." Referring to the hijacking by Lithuanians of a Soviet aircraft in 1970, an incident which resulted in a stewardess' death, he says; "and thanks to a large extent to the widely publicized propaganda by certain Lithuanian emigre circles, the killers were taken under the wing of the U.S. authorities, who make it a rule to give asylum to all kinds of rabble--from war criminals to common felons."

CSO: 1800/193

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

16 APRIL 85